

[4th November 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Have not the Government taken care to get a copy of the judgment, Sir?"

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"I have applied for a copy of the judgment, Sir; but I have not yet received it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"There is no difficulty in the matter at all. There is the decision of the High Court, and the Election Commissioner wants to test it in the Supreme Court also, because it is a matter of principle that is involved. Leave has also been given by the High Court. What the Leader of the Opposition said is quite right, that the appeal does not act as stay by itself. The member can remain here until the matter is decided."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"But no summons has been issued to the Member."

MR. SPEAKER:—"As I said, I have not received a reply from the Governor, as to how the matter has been decided. Until I know definitely, how can I ask the office to issue summons?"

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"ప్రధాన మంత్రి గారినుండి సరియైన సమాధానముకొరకు ఆసుగుతున్నాను. శాసనసభ్యుడైన సాకా వెంకట్రావుగారు తనయొక్క risk మీద శాసనసభలో కూర్చోవచ్చునని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పుతున్నారు. కాని యొక్క attendance register లో వారి పేరు వ్రాసి కొట్టివేసియున్నది. ప్రధానమంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన ప్రకారం వెంకట్రావుగారి పేరు రిజిస్టరులో వ్రాయించినట్లయితే వారియొక్క risk మీద సభలో కూర్చోనటానికి సిద్ధంగా ఉన్నారు."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Let the hon. Member put it in writing and send it on to me; I shall examine that."

IV.—GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION RE HANDLOOM INDUSTRY—cont.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The next item is the debate on the handloom industry. The hon. Member Sri Venkatajagga Rao will now continue his speech. I have reduced the time-limit for each Member to ten minutes."

* SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO:—"అభ్యుదయ, మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వము వారు చేసేత పారిశ్రామిక సమస్యయొక్క బాధ్యత యావత్తూ కూడా కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వము పైననే ఉన్నట్లు, తమకు ఎవ్విధమైన బాధ్యత లేనట్లుగా కూర్చుని చూస్తూన్న దని నేను అంటున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే తమ బాధ్యతకూడా మన రాష్ట్రముగా ఎంతైనా భుజ్యముకూడా వారు ఎవ్విధమైనటువంటి బాధ్యత తీసుకోకుండా ఉంటున్నారని నేను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఎక్కడ అయితే, వివిధ ప్రాంతాలలోనైనా చేసేత పారిశ్రామికములు హెచ్చుగా భుజున్నారో ఆయా ప్రాంతాలలో చేసేత సహకార సంఘాలు ఏర్పాటుచేయడానికి యీ ప్రభుత్వమువారు వెనుకడుగు వేస్తున్నారని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. విప్రాంతాలలోనైనా చేసేత పారిశ్రామికములు హెచ్చుగా ఉన్నారో ఆ ప్రాంతాలలో తప్పకుండా చేసేత పారిశ్రామిక co-operative societies స్థాపించవలసిందిగా ప్రభుత్వంవారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అంతేకాకుండా యిప్పటి పరిస్థితులను బట్టి చేసేత పారిశ్రామికములు co-operative societies లో"

4th November 1952] [Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao]

share ధనము చెల్లించి ఓరుదార్లుగా చేరుటకు అవకాశము లేకుండా భిన్నాభి
ముఖి చేస్తున్నాను. వివేకవంతులైన యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రమ చాల దుర్బల స్థితికి
వచ్చి చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులకు జీవనభృతి తగ్గిపోయినందువల్ల వారు share
ధనమును కట్టలేకుండా యున్నారు. అందుచేత ప్రభుత్వమువారి యీ share
ధనమును చెల్లించి యీ co-operative societies యొక్క లాభమును
పొందేటట్లుగా వారిని చేర్పించవలసిందిగా నేను హృదయపూర్వకముగా
ప్రభుత్వము వారిని కోరుతున్నాను. అసలు యీ చేనేత పారిశ్రామిక సమస్య
పూర్తిగా తీర్చవలసినట్లు ముఖ్యంగా యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు వీరికి కేటాయిం
చదలచిన వీరెలు, దోవతులు మొదలైనవివంటి వాటిని కేటాయించినంత మాత్రముననే
యీ పరిస్థితి తొలగదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా మన రాష్ట్రంలో నూటికి
ఎనిభేమందిగల సామాన్య ప్రజానీకముయొక్క జీవనస్థాయి తగ్గింది అంటే యీ
ప్రజానీకముయొక్క కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిందని చెప్పక తప్పదు. అందువల్ల యీ
చేనేత సమస్య పూర్తిగా పైకితీసుకొని రావటానికి అవకాశనూలేకుండా ఉన్నదని
మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఇప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు వీరియొక్క జీవనస్థాయిని బాగుచేయడా
నికి ప్రయత్నించవలసిందని ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ జీవన స్థాయి
పెచ్చింపు చేయడానికి మన ప్రభుత్వము వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణలను ప్రవేశ పెట్టవల
సిన అవసరమున్నది. అంటే, మన రాష్ట్రంలో పెద్దపెద్ద భూస్వాములవద్ద వందలకొద్ది
ఉన్నటువంటి ఎకరాల భూమిని తీసుకొని క్యవసాయకులీలకు, పేద రైతాంగానికి
అలాగా ముఖ్యంగా విచిత్రముకూడా భూమి లేనివారికియిచ్చి వ్యవసాయ సంస్కరణ
చేయవలెను. ఈ విధంగా ఈ పేద ప్రజానీకముయొక్క జీవనస్థాయిని పెంచినాడే
ఈ చేనేత కారికులయొక్క సమస్య తీర్చడానికి అవకాశము కల్పించగలరని మనవి
చేస్తున్నాను. ఎందుచేతనంటే రెండవ ప్రపంచ యుద్ధమునకుముందు ఈ చేనేత
కారి కులయొక్క స్థితిగతులకు ఈ యదాదానంతరము వారికి భిన్న స్థితిగతులకు
చాలా తేడా వచ్చియున్నది. ఆ రోజులలో ఒక్కొక్క చేనేత పారిశ్రామికుడు నెల
ఒకటింటికి సుమారు ముప్పది రూపాయలు తెచ్చుకుంటూ ఉన్నాడు. ఈ డబ్బుతో ఆ
రోజులలో తన కుటుంబ పోషణ సుఖముగా జరుపుకొనగలిగియున్నాడు. ఎందుచేతనంటే
అనాడు ధాన్యము బస్తా ఒకటింటికి అయిదు, ఆరు రూపాయలు ఖరీదుపెట్టి కొను
క్కిని మిగతా వైకముతో తన కుటుంబ ఖర్చులు భరించుకొగలిగియున్నాడు. అటు
వంటిది ఈ యుద్ధము తరువరి ఈ రోజులలో ధాన్యము బస్తా ఒకటింటికి సుమారు
30 రూపాయలనుండి 35 రూపాయలవరకు పెరిగియున్నది. ఈ నాడు ఈ పారి
శ్రామికుడు తెచ్చుకున్న ముప్పది రూపాయలు ఒక్క వియ్యమునకు మాత్రమే ఖర్చు
అయితే తన కుటుంబమునకు కావలసిన యితర ఖర్చులు మెట్లు భరించగలడో ప్రభు
త్వమువారి గమనించవలెనని కోరుతున్నాను. అందుచేత ఈ చేనేత సమస్య పూర్తిగా
తీర్చవలసిన బాధ్యత ఈ ప్రభుత్వము వారిపై యున్నదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బా
ధ్యత వహించకుండా అది కేవలము కేంద్రప్రభుత్వముదే అయియున్నదని చెప్పడ
మనేది ఈ పేద ప్రజానీకాన్ని మధ్య పెట్టడముకన్న మరేమికాలేదని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.
అందుచేత ముఖ్యంగా ఈ చేనేత పారిశ్రామికులు అందరికీ చేయతగినంత సహాయము
చేయుటకు ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారి బాధ్యత వహించియడల మిగిలినవిషయములను కేంద్ర
ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుట న్యాయము అని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ చేనేత
వారికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు కేటాయించదలచిన వీరెలు, దోవతులు కేటాయించినంత
మాత్రాననే, ఈ సమస్య తీరుదు. వీరికి కావలసినంత నూలు సరఫరా చేయించవలసి
భ్రుంతుంది. అంతేకాకుండా నూలు ధర నూటికి యాభైవంతులు తగ్గించి వీరికి సరే
యించిన యడల వీరు ఈ పరిశ్రమను వృద్ధికి తెచ్చుకొని జీవించగలరు. అంతేకాదు

[Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao] [4th November 1952]

వీరికి ధాన్యములను సరఫరా చేసే కంట్రీలు లేకుండుట వలన చూడవలెను. ఇటువంటి ధాన్యత మన మద్రాసు ప్రభుత్వమువారి వహించి, మిగిలినటువంటి విషయములకు కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వాన్ని కోరి విషయముల అందరు కలిసి కృషిచేయు అవసరము ఎంతైనా ఉన్నది. అందువల్ల ఈ బిల్లును తప్పకుండా ఆమోదించగలరని నా విశ్వాసము. యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు తెచ్చిన తీర్మానమును నేను మనస్ఫూర్తిగా బలపరుస్తూ యింతటితో విరమిస్తున్నాను.

* SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రవేశపెట్టిన ఈ బిల్లులోని ముఖ్యద్దేశానికి నా ఆమోదాన్ని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు నాన్ని సమగ్రంగా చేయాలనే ఉద్దేశ్యంతో కొన్ని సవరణలుకూడా ప్రతిపాదిస్తున్నాను. చేత పరిశ్రమ భారతదేశంలో అనాది సిద్ధంగా వస్తున్న కుటీర పరిశ్రమ. లక్షలాది ప్రజలకు ఇదే జీవనాధారముగా ఉండి ఉండినది. నేడు యీ పరిశ్రమ అత్యంత స్త్రోవ పరిస్థితులకు లోనుకావలసివచ్చింది. చేనేత కార్మికులు కడుపు చేతపట్టుకొని భయభయపడే వలసిన దుర్లభ సూచించింది. ఆంధ్రదేశంలో ఎక్కడ పేద కుటుంబాలవారికి జీవకోపాధి కల్పించే ఈ వృత్తి నేడు వినాశనాన్ని ఎదుర్కొంటోంది. ముఖ్యంగా రాయలసీమలో నేడు చేనేత పాల్త్రామికులు పడుతున్న యిబ్బందులు విమోచనానికి ఉన్నాయి. చిత్రూరు జిల్లాలోని కాళహస్తి, మనసలూరి, వాయిలపాడు తాలూకాలలోను, అనంతపురం జిల్లాలోని ధర్మవరం తాలూకాలలోను, కడప జిల్లా, పులివెందుల, జమ్మలమడుగు, రాజంపేట తాలూకాలలోని చేనేత ప్రజలు పడే బాధలు వర్ణించటానికి వారు రావలసివేదు. వారికి ఈ ప్రభుత్వం చేసిన మేల్కొమ్మి లేవు. సాంప్రదాయ సిద్ధంగా వస్తున్న ఈ పరిశ్రమ నేడు అధోగతిపాశానాంతం యీ నాటివరకూ ప్రభుత్వానికి కనువిప్పుకాలేదు. బిడ్డ ఒకవిధంగా ఈ ప్రస్తుత తీర్మానం శాసన సభ ఎదుటికి వచ్చింది. అది కొంతవరకు మెరుగైన సంతోషిస్తున్నాను. కరువుకాటకాలతో అలమటిస్తున్న రాయలసీమలోని ఈ వీధి ప్రజానీకం కొంతవరకైనా కోలుకోవాల్సివచ్చే ప్రభుత్వంవారు వారికి ఉదారంగా జీవనభృతి ఋణాలివ్వాలి. చాలినంత నూలు సరఫరాచేసి వారికి పనికల్పించాలి. ఆ నూలును తక్కువ ధరకు యివ్వాలి. అందుకు సబ్సిడీని యివ్వాలి. గ్రామ గ్రామాలలో ఉన్న చేనేత కార్మికులను ముసంఘటితపరిచి సహకార సంస్థల అందుబాటులోనికి తీసుకొనిరావాలి. వారి జీవితాలకు ఒకదారి, తెన్ను చూపించాలి. ప్రస్తుతం చేనేత కార్మికులు కో-ఆపరేటివ్ సొసైటీలకు వేరు ధనంకూడా పెల్లించుకోలేని అభివృద్ధి పరిస్థితిలో ఉన్నారు. ఈ పేర్ ధనాన్ని ప్రభుత్వమే వారికిగాను పెల్లించాలి. వారిసందర్భం సహకార సంఘాలలో సభ్యులనుగాచేసి తగినంతపని కల్పించి జీవనభృతిని సంపాదింపజేయటానికి వారికి అనుకూలం కలుగజేయాలి. ముఖ్యంగా చేనేత పరిశ్రమ ఈ దేశంలో బ్రతకాలంటే దానికి మిల్లు పోటీలేకుండా చేయాలి. యాంత్రికమైన మిల్లు పరిశ్రమ అనుగతంగా ఈ దేశంలో ఉన్న కుటీర పరిశ్రమను కబిలిచివేయకుండా చూడాలి.

11-40
a.m.

“చేనేత పరిశ్రమ దిగినారి పోతోందని ఒకవంక చెబుతున్న ఈ ప్రభుత్వం నేటికీ కూడా అమ్మకపు పన్నును ఆ పరిశ్రమపైరుద్దడం అన్యాయంకాదా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. తాము చేయవలసిన పై సహాయకార్యాక్రమాన్ని చేయకపోవడంవలన కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వంయొక్క నిజాయితీ ఋణాభార కాదు. లక్షలాది ప్రజలు ఆ భార పడివున్న ఒక కుటీర పరిశ్రమ కొనపూపిగిలించే ఉన్నామనా దానిపైన పన్ను భారం తొలగించలేదంటే నిజంగా ఆత్మరక్షణపడవనే వర్తించి, ప్రభుత్వ నిజాయితీని శంకించవలసే వర్తించి. ఈ పన్నును ఇప్పుడైనా రద్దు పరుస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.

4th November 1952] [Sri D. Seetharamiah]

యాధానంతరకాలంలో చేనేత పరిశ్రమ తిన్న చెబ్బనుంచి తట్టుకోవడం అంత నులునైన పనికాదు. ఈ అయిదా రేండ్లుగా చేనేత కార్మికులు కష్టాలుపడిపడి కడకు తమకున్న దంతా కూడా విక్రయించుకున్నారు. ఈ సాధువారికిని కొద్దిపాటి నూలుతో నైనా తయారుచేసిన వస్త్రం అప్పుడుపోక విపరీత దుస్థితిలో పడినారు.

“అంతేకాకుండా చేనేత పరిశ్రమను విదేశీ మిల్లు వస్త్ర వ్యాపార పోటీనుంచి రక్షించవలసిన బాధ్యత ఈ ప్రభుత్వంపై ఉంది. మన దేశంలోని ఇంగ్లీషు మిల్లు యజమానుల పాలనీని కేంద్రప్రభుత్వం అనుసరిస్తున్నది. వీరి పోటీనుండి చేనేత పరిశ్రమను రక్షించాలంటే చేనేతకీళ్ళ మగ్గల నూలును తక్కువ ధరకు యివ్వాలి. ఇందుకై నూలుకు సబ్సిడీ యివ్వాలి. విదేశాలనుంచి కొచ్చు ధరలకు ప్రతిని ఖరీదైన నూలులను తెప్పించి వాటిని చేనేతపరిశ్రమ వేయరాదు మిల్లు యజమానులు నూలు ధరలను పెంచకుండా చూడాలి. ముఠకనూలును దేశవారీ ప్రతికొనే తయారు చేయాలనే నిబంధనను ఉంచాలి. ఒకవంక దేశీయ పరిశ్రమ దిగజారిపోతూవుంటే బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదుల ట్రైల మిల్లు పరిశ్రమలను ప్రోత్సహించడం కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి తగినపని అని గుర్తుకులేవాలి. నూరు, నూటయ్యైదే సంచితవ్వాలి బ్రిటిష్ పరిపాలనలో మన దేశ చేనేత పరిశ్రమ ఎంతో చెబ్బింది. కాంగ్రెస్ వారు అధికారానికి వచ్చిన తరువాతనైనా దానికి అదరణ చూపబడుతుందని ఆశించిన వారికి అశాభంకావాలి.

“అంతేకాకుండా మన చేనేతవస్త్రం ఈనాడు అమెరికా, జపాన్, బ్రిటన్ వస్త్రాల పోటీకి తట్టుకోలేకుండా ఉంది. ఎంతోకాలంగా చిన్నారు జిల్లా, కాళహస్తి తాలూకాలో తయారుచేయబడే పట్టుమార్కు గుడ్డ వస్త్రాకాకు ఎగుమతి చేయబడు తూంది. ప్రస్తుతం జపాన్, అమెరికా, బ్రిటన్ వస్త్రాలతో అచ్చట పోటీ సంభ విండుతున్న మన బట్టకు కొనుగోలు తగ్గిపోయింది. అలాగే బర్మాను మన రాష్ట్రం నుండి పంపబడుతుండే చేతిగుడ్డల యెగుమతి కూడా పడిపోయినది. 1920 వ సంవత్సరంలో మన రాష్ట్రం నుంచి బర్మాకు ఎగుమతి అయిన చేతిగుడ్డలతో ప్రస్తుతం సంపాదించుకున్న సరుకును బర్మియాచిట్ల యితే నూటికి 70 వంతులు తగ్గిపోయిందని ఋజుపత్రమింది. ఈ విషయాన్ని మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వ ఎకనామిక్ ఎన్వైజర్ డాక్టర్ నటరాజుగారి అంగీకరించారు. ఈ విషయాలన్నీటినీ ప్రభుత్వం గమనించాలి. విదేశాలలో మన చేనేత వస్త్రం అప్పుడుపోటానికి అవసరమైన సదుపాయాలన్నీటినీ కలుగజేయాలని కేంద్ర ప్రభుత్వానికి మదరాసు ప్రభుత్వం తెప్పవలసివుంది. అంతే కాకుండా విదేశ వస్త్రాల దిగుమతులనుకూడా అరికట్టవలసిన ఆగత్యం ఉంది.

“చేనేత వస్త్రానికి ప్రోత్సాహమివ్వటానికి ప్రభుత్వం హృదయపూర్వకంగా పని చేయాలి. ముందుగా ప్రభుత్వ శాఖలలో అవసరమైన వస్త్రాలు చేనేతవిగానే భ్రండు నట్లు చూడాలి. ఇందువల్ల ఈనాడు ముగిరియివున్న చేనేత వస్త్రం విడుదల అవటమేకాక ఇతరులకూడా చేనేత వస్త్రాన్ని కొనుటకు ప్రోత్సాహం కలుగుతుంది. చేనేత బట్టలకు ఒక పెద్ద మార్కెట్టు తద్వారా జరుగుతుంది.

“చేనేత పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధి కావాలంటే, విదేశ వస్త్రాల పోటీకి తట్టుకోవాలంటే ఆ పరిశ్రమ యాంత్రికముగా అభివృద్ధి చెందవలసివుంది. తక్కువ ఖరీదుతో ఎక్కువ గుడ్డను ఉత్పత్తిచేసే విధముగా యంత్రం అభివృద్ధి చేయబడాలి. కార్మికుని సృజనాత్మక శక్తిని సక్రమంగా వినియోగించుకోవాలి. అతనికి సంకల్పపీకరమైన కూలి కొడుకునట్లు చూడాలి. అందుకుగాను ఒక ప్రత్యేక టెక్నికల్ కమిటీని ఏర్పాటు చేయాలి. ఈ విషయమై శ్రద్ధ తీసుకోవలసి ఉంది.

[4th November 1952

' Add the following at the end :—

(f) to institute a technical committee to improve the productive capacity of the handloom industry at a lower cost." " "

“இன்றையதினம் சேலத்திலிருந்தும், கோயமுத்தூரிலிருந்தும் குடும்பம் குடும்பமாக பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகின்ற கூட்டத்தைப் பார்க்கிறோம். ஊர் ஊராக பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிற கூட்டத்தார் யாராக இருக்க முடியுமென்று சிந்திக்கின்றபோது அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் தான் என்ற முடிவுக்கு வரவேண்டிய நிலைமையாக இருக்கிறது. அந்த நிலையில் குடும்பம் குடும்பமாக, ஊர் ஊராக பட்டினி ஊர்வலம் வந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறார்களே, அவர்கள் யார்? அவர்கள் தான் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள். அவர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கண்ணாங்குத்துமாக ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கக்கூடிய இந்த தீர்மானம் வரவேற்கத்தகுந்த விஷயம்.

4th November 1952] [Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar]

“கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு 40-ம் நெம்பர் வரையிலும் நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்தவிட்டால் போதாது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் விஷயத்தில் பல விஷயங்கள் கவனிக்கப்படவேண்டியிருக்கிறது. ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் சொன்ன உபதேசத்தை இன்றைய தினம் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் கடைப்பிடித்து வருகிறார்கள். அதாவது ஸ்ரீமான் முன்ஷி அவர்கள் மாடு தின்னும் புண்ணாக்கையும், பருத்திக்கொட்டையையும் மக்கள் சாப்பிட உபதேசம் செய்தார். புண்ணாக்குத் தீன்பவர்கள் யாராவது இருக்கின்றார் என்று சொன்னால் அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள்தான்.

“குறிப்பாக தென் ஆற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் என்னுடைய தொகுதியாகிய விக்ரவாண்டியில் ஏராளமான கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்கள் புண்ணாக்கைத் தின்ன உண்ணவேண்டிய நிலையில் இருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு கிராமத்தில் மக்கள் ‘நாங்கள் நான்கு மூட்டை புண்ணாக்கு தின்றோம்’, இன்னொரு கிராமத்தில் ‘நாங்கள் ஐந்து மூட்டை புண்ணாக்கு தின்றோம்’ என்று சொல்லிக்கொள்வதைக் கேட்கிறோம். இந்த நிலைமைக்குக் காரணம் என்னவென்றால், என் தொகுதியில் அரிசி கிடையாது, சோளம் கிடையாது என்ற நிலை இருக்கிறது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பட்டினியாக இருந்து கொண்டு எப்படி துணி நெய்யமுடியும்? உணவுப் பஞ்சத்தை முதலில் நீக்கவேண்டும். அடுத்தபடியாக, நெய்வதற்கு உரிமை கொடுத்துவிட்டால் மட்டும் போதாது. நம் நாட்டில் விநியோகசூடிய பஞ்சானது வெளிநாட்டுக்குப் போகாமல் தடுக்கவேண்டும். வடநாட்டிலிருந்து தென்னாட்டுக்கு இறக்குமதியாகும் பம்பாய், ஆமதாபாத், மில் துணிகள் வராமல் தடுக்கவேண்டும். அப்படி வடநாட்டிலிருந்து மில் துணிகள் இங்கு வருமேயானால், அதற்குப் பணம் கொடுப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக கைத்தறி துணிகளையே நாம் திருப்பி அந்த வடநாட்டுக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்ற விஷயத்தை வலியுறுத்திக் கூற விரும்புகிறேன்.

“மேலும், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் மாதம் முப்பது நாட்களுக்கு வேலை 11-50 செய்வதற்குப் போதிய வேலையில்லை. வேலைக்குத் தகுந்த கூலியும் அவர்கள் களுக்குக் கிடைப்பதில்லை. இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருப்பது அவர்களை கண்களைத் துடைப்பதுபோல் இல்லாமல் உண்மையாகவே அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களைப் போக்குவதற்குவேண்டிய வழிவகைகளைச் செய்வது அரசாங்கத்தின் கடமை. மில் துணி குறைந்த விலைக்குக் கிடைக்கிறது, அழகாகவும் இருக்கிறது. ஆகையினால் மக்களுக்கு மில் துணிகளின்மீது கண்ணாட்டம் பேசுகிறது. கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குணங்களை உண்மையிலேயே திரைக்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தோடு இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அரசாங்கம் கொண்டுவந்திருக்குமேயானால், இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை அமல் நடத்துவதற்கு உண்மையிலேயே நல்ல அபிப்பிராயம் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்குமேயானால் அரசாங்கம் கைத்தறித் துணிகளுக்கென்று நூலின் விலையைக் குறைக்கவேண்டும். கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்களுடைய நிலைமையை உயர்த்தவேண்டும். கைத்தறித் துணியின் விலையைக் குறைத்தால் தான் எல்லா மக்களும் வாங்குவார்கள்.

“காந்திஜியின் திட்டங்களிலேயே மிக முக்கியமானது கதர் திட்டம். எல்லோரும் கதரைத்தான் கட்டவேண்டும் என்று உபதேசம் செய்துவந்தது போல கைத்தறித் துணியைத் தவிர வேறு துணியை கட்டக்கூடாதென்றும் அரசாங்க உத்தியோகத்திலிருக்கக்கூடிய கீழ்த்தர சிப்பந்திகளுக்குக் கொடுக்கப்படும் துணி கைத்தறித் துணியாகத்தான் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்று முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் வற்புறுத்தி ஒரு உத்தரவு போடலாம்.

“அந்த நிலையில், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை நிலையை உயர்த்தவேண்டியது அவசியம். கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய நிலைமை உயர்ந்தால்தான் நாடு உயரும். ஆகவே, அவர்கள் விஷயத்தில் கண்ணாங்குருத்தமாக இருக்கவேண்டும். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்து நிறைவேற்றிவிட்டால் மட்டும் போதாது.

“இந்த நாட்டிலிருந்து வடநாட்டுக்குப் போயிருக்கிற டி.டி.கே. அவர்கள் நம் நாட்டை அடகு காட்டி ராஜாஜி அவர்களை எதிர்த்துப்போராடுகிறார்கள். அவர்கள் மனப்பான்மையைத் திருத்தவேண்டியது ராஜாஜி அவர்களுடைய

[Sri A. Govindaswami Nayagar] [4th November 1952]

கடமையாக இருக்கின்றது. ஆகவே, டி.டி.கே. போன்றவர்களுக்கு மில் முதலாளிகளுடன் தொடர்பு இருக்கமுடியும். ஆனால், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் அதிகமாக வாழ்கின்ற பிராந்தியத்தைச் சேர்ந்த சேலத்திலிருந்து ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் வந்திருக்கின்ற காரணத்தினால் சேலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறையையும் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுடைய குறையையும் போக்க வேண்டியது சர்க்காரின் கடமை. அவர்கள் வேலையில்லாமல் கஷ்டப்படுகிறார்கள்.

“ பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் தென்னாற்காடு ஜில்லாவில் ஸ்ரீமான் மாணிக்கவேலு நாயக்கர் சுற்றுப்பிரயாணம் செய்தபோது செஞ்சிக்கும் வந்திருந்தார். அவருடைய கூட்டத்திற்கு ஜனங்களை எப்படிக்கூட்டினார்கள் தெரியுமா? ‘ பெண்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் சேலக் கஷ்டத்தைப்போக்க மந்திரி அவர்கள் வந்திருக்கின்றார்கள்’ என்று ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று கூப்பிட்டார்கள். அதை நம்பி அரை நிர்மாணமாக துணியில்லாமல் பெண்கள் ஓடிவந்தார்கள். கட்டத்துணி இல்லையென்று அப்பொழுது கதறி விட்டார்கள். அவர்கள் பிணைக்கைத்தின்று வயிறு உப்பிவிடுகிறது என்று மந்திரியிடம் முறையிட்டனர். மேலும் கட்டத் துணியில்லாமல் என்ன செய்யமுடியும்? இந்தப் பஞ்சத்தை அவர்கள் எப்படித் தீர்க்கப் போகிறார்கள் என்று தெரியவில்லை. பஞ்சத்தால் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கும் அத்தனை பேர்களும் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள்தான். அவர்களில் அனேகமாக பருத்தி உற்பத்தி செய்கின்றவர்களும் இருக்கின்றார்கள். நம்முடைய நாட்டுக்காகவே நாங்கள் ஒவ்வொரு காரியமும் செய்து வருகிறோம், ஒவ்வொருவரும் நாட்டுக்காக உழைக்கவேண்டுமென்று உபதேசம் எந்த தேச பக்தர்கள் செய்தார்களோ அவர்கள் இப்பொழுது அதைச் செய்ய வேண்டிய காலம் வந்துவிட்டது. ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் குறைகளை அறவே போக்கி அவர்களுக்கு நல்லது செய்வார்களே யானால் அரசாங்கத்திற்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய கெட்ட பெயர் நங்கும் என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்துடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I congratulate the Government not only on behalf of the handloom weavers, but also on behalf of the people of this State on having tabled a resolution favouring the reservation of dhoties and sarees exclusively for the handloom industry, particularly at this opportune time. Sir, this resolution has given an opportunity for this House to express its opinion regarding the future of the handloom as well as the textile mill industry in the country and it is also providing a rare opportunity to the people of this State to understand the merits of the case of the handloom weavers.

“ The resolution raises several fundamental issues including firstly, whether there is competition between the mills and the handlooms; secondly, whether the handloom industry requires protection against the competition of the textile mills, if it is admitted that competition exists between the mills and the handlooms; thirdly, what shall be the nature and form of protection to be given to the handloom industry; and fourthly, what will be the effects of providing protection to the handloom industry on the textile mills and also on the consuming public.

(At this stage the Deputy Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“ Sir, coming to the issue of competition between the textile mills and the handlooms, it is an admitted fact that there is keen

4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

competition between them. Handlooms in ancient times were supplying the entire clothing requirements of the country; but to-day they are not allowed to produce even one-third of the entire clothing requirements of the country, because of the fundamental change in the structure of the handloom industry. Formerly, handloom weavers were getting yarn from every family, to which they were returning the cloth in turn; but to-day they are made entirely to depend upon the textile mills for their main raw material, viz., yarn. By taking this advantage of the entire dependence of the handlooms for yarn on the mills, the mills, with the active help, continuous support and protection of the Government, have encroached into the field of cloth production and have to-day covered two-thirds of the total production of cloth in the country. Thus, the textile mill industry has deprived millions of handloom weavers of their ancient hereditary and honest profession. Now, what more proof is necessary to show that the textile mills are not only competing with the handlooms, but also contemplating the complete extinction of the handlooms? In fact, the competition between the textile mills and the handlooms was long ago admitted. In this connexion, I wish to quote the findings of the Tariff Board appointed in the year 1932. The Tariff Board in their report on the cotton industry in 1932 wrote that 'the mills for whose assistance duties were levied, have benefited more from them and therefore have become better able to fight the handloom industry.'

'At a later stage, the Government of India in their resolution, dated the 25th January 1941, appointing a Fact Finding Committee (Handlooms and Mills) stated—

12
noon.

'The problem of safeguarding the position of the handloom industry and at the same time reconciling the conflicting interests of the handloom and the mill industries has been under the consideration of the Government of India for the last few years and has been raised more than once at the industries conferences.'

They have also asked the Fact Finding Committee 'to compare the nature of the products of the handloom industry in each area surveyed with the corresponding mill products and to find the nature of the competition between the two. The Fact Finding Committee found out that there was competition between textile mills and the handloom industry and definitely stated—

'In sarees, competition is most serious in counts 20s to 40s. Even in higher counts there has lately grown powerful mill competition. In the case of choties also direct mill competition is in respect of medium counts and in gunghas, chaddars, shirrings and coatings also mill competition of a serious nature has developed.'

In the year 1949, the Government of India appointed a Standing Handloom Committee to go into the question of the competition of textile mills with handlooms and to suggest measures for the effective protection of the handlooms against the competition of the mills. The Committee in their resolution stated—

'The Committee are emphatically of the opinion that it is necessary to afford to the handloom industry a permanent measure of protection—

(a) by the imposition of an excise duty on the products of the mill industry; and

(b) by the reservation of a suitable field of production for the handloom industry.'

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

[4th November 1952]

Finally in the year 1949, the Government of India appointed a sub-committee but unfortunately with a predominant representation to the textile mills, to go into the question of reserving certain fields of production of textiles exclusively for the handloom industry. The principle of reserving certain fields of production of cloth for the handloom industry has been accepted by the Sub-Committee, and the Government in accordance with the Committee's recommendation have reserved certain varieties of cloth exclusively for the handloom industry. But that was a nominal reservation because most of the varieties reserved for the handloom industry were already the complete monopoly of the handloom industry and therefore, the handloom industry could not derive any material benefit from the reservation which was made in 1949 and hence the need to extend the field of reservation to the handloom industry.

"Coming to the issue why the handloom industry requires protection against the mill competition, I would like to say, that if the mills in the country had confined themselves mainly to spinning as they did in the past, the question of giving protection to the handloom industry would not have arisen at all. But they did not rest content with spinning alone and they have taken up weaving of cloth and have captured a larger portion of the internal cloth market and have thus deprived the handloom weavers of their honest means of livelihood. So, there is an urgent need for providing protection to the handloom industry. It is an admitted fact that still two crores of people are clinging on to the handloom industry in the fond hope, that the Government would not before long give them adequate protection against the competition of the mills. It is, therefore, for the Government to consider how long they can afford to neglect their duty towards the suffering millions of handloom weavers in the country. The mere supply of yarn to the handloom weavers cannot solve their problems. The Government must secure a stable and an assured market for the handloom products and with that purpose in view, they will have to reserve certain fields of production of textiles for them. There are two more important considerations for giving protection to handloom industry. One is that the handloom industry can absorb many more unemployed people besides the 20 millions who are already engaged in it and secondly, it eliminates the conflict between capital and labour and also banishes the growth of the present Communist trends which is but the necessary consequence of the exploitation of labour by capital. The handloom weavers therefore have every right to demand from their Government to safeguard their industry against the competition of the mills. Because the mechanical set-up of the powerlooms in the mills, which can conveniently work with more than two treadles and two healds, is best suited for production of twills, drills, satins and similar other varieties, the handloom weavers are urging that the production of dhoties and sarees should be reserved to them. The mechanical set-up of the handloom, which generally works with two healds, is best suited for the production of the dhoties and sarees. There is no use in asking weavers to produce what they

4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

cannot produce. I would like, in this connexion, to make a few remarks on the statements made by mill-owners on the question of the reservation of dhoties and sarees to the handloom industry. They tried to scare away the public by telling them that the handlooms cannot produce the required quantity of sarees and dhoties and the price of the handloom cloth will be prohibitive. With regard to the production capacity of the handlooms from my own experience I can say, that from 7 to 8 yards of cloth can be easily produced in a working day of eight hours on a single loom and on this basis 2,000 yards can be produced on a single loom in a year and if we take into account the fact that 29 lakhs of looms are working in the country, they can easily produce 5,800 millions of yards of cloth provided the Government make the mills to afford a plentiful supply of yarn for the handlooms at reasonably reduced rates. With regard to the cost of production of cloth by handlooms, the propaganda of the textile mills is not only incorrect but also misleading. It is an admitted fact that the handloom weaver is paying 25 per cent extra over the cost price of the yarn and it is not therefore the fault of the weaver if his cloth costs more and is 5 to 10 per cent higher than the price of a similar cloth produced by the mills. Far from that, it proves that the cost of production of handloom cloth is cheaper than the cost of production of cloth in mills.

“ Sir, in this connexion I wish to quote a relevant portion from the memorandum submitted by the Madras Provincial Handloom Weavers' Congress, Nidubrolu, to the Prime Minister of India on 1st April 1950, about the high costings of cloth in mills—

12-10
p.m.

“ As per the costings given by the Textile Commissioner, Government of India, Bombay, in his No. TCSI/CYC-OP, dated the 27th January 1950, the ultimate cost of production of cloth in mills ranges between 6 and 7 annas and even more in some cases per a knot (8,400 yards) of yarn. The lay man knows and calculates only the cost of the actual weaving on the speedy power loom. He does not know how much more the mills will have to spend in the form of (a) interest on capital, (b) depreciation on machinery, buildings and fixtures (c) Insurance charges, (d) Fuel or power charges, (e) Taxes, (f) Establishment including labour and cost of management, (g) advertisement and other trade charges. When the cumulative effect of all these items is taken into account the ordinary man will be surprised to know that a yard of even plain cloth is now produced on a handloom at less cost than on a power loom in a mill. This feature explains why less efficient mills are given additional margins of profit by permitting them to sell their products direct to consumers.”

“ I also wish to point out that the newly-started textile mills are being given adequate protection against the competition of the efficient mills. Firstly, they are exempted from the levy of all taxes. Secondly, they are allowed to sell their products directly to the consumers, thus allowing them to make a profit of more than 6½ per cent an efficient mill can earn.

“ Sir, the Bombay Mill Owners' Association have also suggested that the handlooms should confine themselves to the production of artistic and costly cloth required by the richer classes of the people. It is a fact that some of the handlooms had and have been confining themselves to the production of artistic and costly fabrics required by the richer classes of people, but the percentage of the costly and artistic fabrics formed about 2 to 3 per cent of the total

[Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

[4th November 1952]

production of the handloom cloth. Therefore, they cannot afford any adequate protection to all the 29 lakhs looms working in the country. The secret in the suggestion of the mill-owners, is that mills with their mechanical set-ups, are not suitable for producing any artistic or costly fabrics.

" With regard to the distribution of yarn, it was stated in the resolution, that adequate quantities of yarn should be made available to the handloom industry. But I want to make it clear that, under the existing distribution scheme brought into force in the year 1945, the composite and the weaving mills are allowed to draw their requirements in full as a first charge on the total production of yarn and the balance is first shared by hosiery knitting factories, the fishermen, and other miscellaneous consumers, and the balance if any left is being distributed among the handloom weavers. I, therefore, like to stress that Government should see that the handloom industry gets adequate quantity of yarn from the mills, and for this purpose they must see that the full requirements of the handloom industry shall be met as a first charge on the total production of yarn in that country. That is the only solution for getting adequate quantities of yarn for the handloom industry.

" With regard to prices, both the Government and the mills have done great harm to the handloom industry. Though the price of cotton has been going down from the beginning of this year, the Government have been trying to maintain a high level of yarn prices to the best advantage of the mills and to the detriment of the handloom industry. In fact when the price of cotton per candy was Rs. 250 on 30th June 1939, the price of the following counts of yarn was as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.	
20s	3	12	0	per 10 lb.
40s	5	4	0	Do.
60s	7	6	0	Do.
80s	11	2	0	Do.

Now, the cost of cotton per candy is about Rs. 700 and the cost of yarn is as follows :—

	RS.	A.	P.		
20s	19	0	0	per 10 lb.	
40s	24	10	6	Do.	(If spun out of Indian cotton.)
	44	14	0	Do.	(If spun out of admixture of foreign cotton.)
60s	57	4	6	Do.	
80s	72	15	6	Do.	

This clearly indicates that there is no relation between the actual cost of cotton and the ex-mill price of yarn. Therefore, there is the imperative need to reduce the price of yarn at least in proportion to the fall in prices of cotton.

4th November 1952] [Sri Pragada Kotaiah]

"Sir, I wish to say a few words about control on cotton. At present, the Indian cotton is the cheapest cotton. In the world market, the price of cotton per candy is not less than Rs. 1,700. But here the price of Indian cotton per candy is about Rs. 700 only. Therefore, the mills are exporting Indian cotton to foreign countries to fetch more profits and importing cotton into the country and dumping finer counts of yarn with high prices on the handloom industry. Also, the quantity of coarse yarn produced in the country is being exported to countries like Ceylon, Burma, Siam where hitherto handloom cloth was being sold. Thus the mills are making profits by exporting cheap cotton and yarn and, at the same time, they are dumping high-priced yarn on the handloom weavers. The matter must be looked into and the Government should see that yarn at a reasonable price is made available to the handloom industry."

* DR. T. S. SOUNDARAM RAMACHANDRAN :— "கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தக் கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலானது, உணவு மனிதனுக்கு எப்படி அவசியமோ அதேபோல் இதுவும் அவசியம் என்று உணர்ந்து இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தைக் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிறார்கள். இது ஒரு ஜீவாதாரத் தொழில் என் னது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். இந்த சமயத்தில் கைத்தறி நெசவுக்குப் பேர்போன ரம்முடைய சென்னை மாகாணத்தில் இந்தக் கிளர்ச்சியை உண்டு பண்ணினது ரொம்ப நியாயம். இதை சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலி ருந்தே கொண்டு வந்து, கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களுக்கு வேலை கொடுப்பதற்கும், அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத்தரம் உயர்வதற்கும், அவர்கள் நன்றாக காலட்சேபம் பண்ணுவதற்கும் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை இந்த சட்ட சபையில் இந்த நேரத்தில் கொண்டு வந்தது ரொம்பவும் பொருத்தமானது. இதில் அவசியமான குழப்பத்தைப் புகுத்தி கருத்து வேற்றுமைகளையும், மன வேற்றுமைகளையும் கொண்டு வராமல் இதை ஏக மனதாக நிறைவேற்றினால் பெருமைக்கு உகந்ததாக இருக்கும்.

"இந்த சமயத்தில் இதைப் பற்றி இன்னும் சில விஷயங்களைச் சொல்ல 12-20 விரும்புகிறேன். புள்ளி விவரங்களைப் பற்றி எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். p.m. அதைப் பற்றி அதிகமாகச் சொல்ல வேண்டியதில்லை. ஆனால் நாம் எந்த மனப்பான்மையுடன், எந்த லட்சியத்துடன் இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றவேண்டுமென்கிறதைப் பற்றி ஒன்றிரண்டு விஷயங்களை மட்டில் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். நமக்கு முன்னால் எதிர்காலத்தில் பயங்கரமான பஞ்ச காலம் இருக்கிறது. மனிதனுக்கு உணவும், உடையும் வேண்டும் என்பது மட்டும் அல்ல, இப்பொழுது திராத வேலையில்லா திண்டாட்டம் என்ற பிரச்சனையை எவ்வளவு தராம் சமாளிக்கப் போகிறோம் என்ற ஒரு மகத்தான பிரச்சனை இருக்கிறது. அதை நீக்கவதற்கு என்ன இருக்கிறது என்பதை ஆலோசிக்கும்படி, என்னுடைய சகாப்திகளை நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த விஷயத்தில் அவசியத்திற்கும் மேலான அதிகப்படியான ஜனங்களுக்கு வாழ்க்கைக்கு வேண்டியதை மட்டும் கொடுக்க முடியாது. குடிசைத் தொழிலுக்கு அதிகமான மூலதனம் இல்லாத ஏழை மக்களுக்கு வருவாய் கிடைக்கக் கூடிய தொழில் இந்தக் கைத்தொழில் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். இந்தக் குடிசைத் தொழில் ரொம்பவும் புராதனமானது, இதில்தேர்ச்சி பெற்ற கோடிக் கணக்கான நெசவாளர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். யாதொரு மூலதனமும் இல்லாத வெறும் கருவிகளைக் கொண்டுள்ள தொழிலில் ஒன்று இருக்கிறது என்றால் அது இந்தக் கைத்தறித் தொழில் தான். இதை நாம் ஆதரிக்கும் முன் இதையொட்டி ஒன்றிரண்டு விஷயங்களை மனதில் வைத்தக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதற்கும் ஒரு தேவை வரும் என்பதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்தக்கொள்ள வேண்டும் என்று சொல்லிக் கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன். இப்பொழுது கைத்தறி தொழில் எப்படி லட்சக் கணக்கான மக்களுக்கும், குடும்பங்களுக்கும் வாழ்க்கை வசதி அளிக்கிறதோ அதைப் போலவே கடரும் அளிக்கிறது என்பதை இந்த சமயத்தில் குறிப்பிடாமல் இருக்க முடியாது. கடற் நெசவு என்று

[Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran] [4th November 1952]

சொல்லும்போது கையால் நூற்கிற நூலைக் கையால் நெசவு பண்ணுவது என்பதாகும். ஸ்திரீகள் வேலையில்லாத நேரங்களில் நூற்பது மூலமாக கொஞ்சம் ஒன்றிரண்டு ரூபாய் வந்தால் அவர்களுடைய வாழ்க்கை வளம் பெறச் செய்யும். கைத்தறியை ஆதரிக்க வேண்டுமென்றும் ஜனங்களுக்கு உற்சாகம் ஏற்படுத்துவதன் பொருட்டும் அதற்கு திட்டங்கள் போடும்போது நீங்கள் கதரை மறந்து விடக்கூடாது என்றும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இது ஒரு சிறந்த பிரச்சனை என்பதற்காக அதைப் பற்றி சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன்.

“குடிசைத் தொழிலை நாம் ஆதரிக்கவேண்டியதோடு மட்டுமல்லாமல் சீக்கிரத்திலேயே அதை சீர்படுத்த ஒரு காலம் வரும். ஆகவே இந்தக் கைத்தறித் தொழிலை எல்லோரும் ஒருமுகமாக ஆதரிக்க வேண்டும். அதனால் இந்த வேலையில்லா திண்டாட்டம் ஒழியவேண்டும். இந்த நெருக்கடி காலத்தில் ஜனங்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைக்கு வழி செய்யவேண்டும். இதில் கருத்து வேற்றுமை இல்லாது ஒரே மனப்பான்மையுடன் இதை ஆதரித்து சர்க்கார் கையை பலப்படுத்தி இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றி வைக்க வேண்டுமென்று நான் கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—“கொஞ்சம், ఈ లీక్చరుని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. అయితే, ఇదే సమయంలో ఈ లీక్చరునల్ల, దీని సమస్యలని కొన్ని పద్ధతులు అమలు జరుపుకుంటే ఈ సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారమవుతుందని అనుకోవడం చాలా ప్రయత్నం దాని లీనినవలసిందని నేను హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈ లీక్చరుని అనుసరించి, దీనితోపాటు ఇంకా కొన్ని పర్యలు ప్రభుత్వం లీసుకొంటేనే తప్ప ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికుల సమస్య పూర్తిగా పరిష్కారంకాదు, అనేటటువంటి విషయము ప్రభుత్వం గుర్తించాలని చెప్పేసికొండ నేను ఈ సందర్భంలో హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈ లీక్చరులో stable అనే పదము వాడబడింది. అయితే ఆ పదము ఆ విధంగా వాడబడడం అనేది ఒక ప్రయత్నం దానిలిస్తుంది. కాని ఇది శాశ్వత పరిష్కార మార్గముకాదు. ఇప్పుడు చేయుచున్నటువంటి కార్యము తాత్కాలిక ఉపశాంతి మాత్రమే. దీని సమస్యలని పరిష్కరించు పర్యలు లీసుకొంటేనే తప్ప ఈ సమస్య పూర్తిగా, శాశ్వతముగా పరిష్కారముకాదని నేను నొక్కి చెప్పవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అందుచేత ఈ హెచ్చరికను ప్రభుత్వము ప్రత్యేకముగా గమనింపవలసియున్నది. ఈ రోజున చేనేత కార్మికులందరూ ఈ విధంగా అవస్థపడుతున్న పేద జనము అనేకమంది, లక్షలకొలది, కోట్లకొలది మన దేశములో ఉన్నారు. కాని వారిందరిని గుర్తించినా, గుర్తించకపోయినా, ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులైనా ఎక్కువ కష్టపడుతున్నారని, చాలా ఇబ్బందులకు లోబడి అనేక అవస్థలు పడుతున్నారని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించినందుకు సంతోషిస్తున్నాను. ముఖ్యంగా చేనేత పార్టీశామికుల పరిస్థితి చాలా అధ్వాన్నముగా ఉన్నదనే విషయాన్ని నొక్కి చెప్పవలసిన అవసరము లేదు. దీన్ని గురించి ఇదివరకు అనేకమంది గౌరవనీయ సభ్యులు చెప్పారు. ఒక సంవత్సరం క్రితము ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులు పొందుతున్న మజూరి దాదాపు రూ 1-4-0 ల వరకు ఉండగా, ఈ రోజున సానైటీలలోగూడ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులు పొందుతున్న మజూరి 0-8-0 మాత్రమే అయివున్నది. అయితే, ఈనాడు, ధాన్యము ధర, బియ్యము ధర కూస్తే, ఇదివరకు అసగా సంవత్సరము క్రితముకంటే ఇప్పుడు దాదాపు రెట్టింపు పెరిగిపోయినదనే విషయము అందరికీ తెలిసినదే. అటువంటిప్పుడు, ముందు ఇచ్చిన 1-4-0 మజూరిని ఇప్పుడు 0-8-0 కి తగ్గించారంటే, ఇక ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికులు పడుతున్న ఇబ్బందులు ఎంత ఎక్కువగా ఉన్నవో, దాన్ని గురించి ప్రత్యేకముగా చెప్పవలసినటువంటి పనిలేదు. కనుక ఈవిధంగా అనేక అవస్థలు పడుచూ దారుణమైనటువంటి కడవుకు గరి అయినటువంటి ఈ చేనేత పార్టీశామికుల యొక్క పరిస్థితి కాగనోయడము కోసరము ఏ ఒక్క చిన్న పనిచేసినప్పటికీ, దానిని

4th November 1952] [Sri M. Hanumantha Rao]

అధిపతిని పంపించియుంటుంది. అందుకనే ఈ లిక్కానాన్ని బలపరచున్నాను. ఇదే సందర్భంలోనే దీనికి కొన్ని సవరణలు కూడా ప్రతిపాదించబడినవి. ఆ సవరణలను అంగీకరించినప్పుడే ప్రభుత్వము హృదయపూర్వకముగా ఈ సమస్యను పరిష్కరించుటకు పూనుకొన్నదని చెప్పడానికి వీలు ఆవుతుంది. ముఖ్యంగా విదేశ వస్త్రముల దిగుమతిపై, విదేశీ పోటీపై మన దేశపు వస్త్ర పరిశ్రమలపై దెబ్బపడుతున్నదనే విషయాన్ని కూడ ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించవలసియున్నది. ఇటీవల ఆంధ్రప్రదేశ్ లోని మహాసభ ఒకటి జరిగింది. అప్పుడు, జవాను మిల్లు ఒట్టల వర్కరులు, అమెరికన్ వర్కరులు ఇంగ్లీషు వర్కరులు, ఇతర ప్రాంతాల వ్యాపారస్థులందరికూడ అక్కడ సమావేశమై, ఏ విధంగా విదేశ వస్త్రములను పంపిణీ చేసుకొంటామని, ఏ విధంగా విభజించుకొంటామని చర్చించారు కాని వారు ఒక పరిష్కార మార్గమునకు రాలేకపోయారు. ఇందుకు పర్యవసానంగా సామ్రాజ్యవాదులదే పెత్తనమే పోయింది. అమెరికన్ కోటీశ్వరులు అమెరికన్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు, అన్నిటిని స్వాధీనముచేసుకొని, జవాను పరిశ్రమలను కూడవారు స్వాధీనముచేసుకొని మూర్ఖ దేశాలకు గడ్డను దిగుమతి చేయడానికి ప్రయత్నము చేస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి గొప్ప పోటీని ఎదుర్కోవడం మన భారతదేశములో ఉన్నటువంటి ఈ వస్త్రపరిశ్రమకు చాలా కష్టమైయుంటుంది విషయము. అదే సమయంలో ఇంగ్లీషు గడ్డలకూడా జోరుగా దిగుమతి అగుచునే ఉన్నది. మనము ఎంతోకాలం నుంచి విదేశ వస్త్రములను నిషేధించాలని వాటిని దిగుమతి చేసుకోవడం మన చేనేత పారిశ్రామికాలను కాపాడాలని జాతీయోద్యమములచేసి ఆశించియుంటుంటే కార్యము ఇక్కడికిని ఫలింపకుండుట విచారకరము. విదేశమునుండి దిగుమతిలేకుండా చేయవలసిన మనదేశములో ఉత్పత్తి అధికము చేయుటకు మిల్లు పరిశ్రమ అభివృద్ధిచెందవలసియున్నది. ఈ విధంగా మనదేశంలో మిల్లు పరిశ్రమను అభివృద్ధిపరచి విదేశవస్త్రాల దిగుమతిని నిరోధించాలి. జాతీయోద్యమమునకు నాయకత్వము వహిస్తూన్నందున వారు ఈ రోజు అధికారములో మంత్రివర్గములో ఉన్నప్పుడు, వారికి ఇది మొదటి చర్యగా మొదటి బాధ్యతగా గుర్తించవలసిన విధియని నేను మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ సందర్భమున ఈ లిక్కానానికి ఒక సవరణ ప్రతిపాదించబడింది. దీనిని అంగీకరించవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. ఇంకొక విషయమున్నది. మన దేశములో ప్రజల కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిపోతున్నది. ఈ రోజు లిండిలేక ఎంతకుంది అవస్థపడుతున్నారో, అంతకంటే ఎక్కువమంది గుడ్డలేక అవస్థపడుతున్నారని అను విషయాన్ని కూడ గుర్తించవలసిన మనసగుచున్నది. అయిదు సంవత్సరములక్రితము సగటు మనిషి 1 కి 16 గజాలు గడ్డ వాడుతూయుండగా ఈ రోజున 12 గజాలో, 11 గజాలో మాత్రమే వాడుచున్నట్లు తెలుస్తున్నది. ఈ రీతిగా గుడ్డ వాడడము మన దేశములో తగ్గిపోయిందంటే అందుకు కారణము కొనుగోలు శక్తి తగ్గిపోయిపోతున్నదనే గ్రహించవలసియున్నది. ఈ కొనుగోలుశక్తి వృద్ధికానిదే చేనేత పారిశ్రామికాల సమస్యపరిష్కారముకావాలనికూడా గ్రహించాలని నేను హెచ్చరిస్తున్నాను. ఈనాడు చేనేత పరిశ్రమలో చాలా చీరలు, దోవతలు ఉత్పత్తి చేయబడుతూనే యున్నవి, కాని ఏ స్టాంటిలోమోచినా, సరకు నిలువ ఉండిపోతున్నది. ఈ సరకుకు మార్కెట్టు లభించుటకు ప్రజలందరు చేనేత దోవతలను, చీరలనే కట్టి చేనేతపారిశ్రామికాలకు సహాయముచేయండిని మొట్టమొదట ఒక విజ్ఞప్తిచేశారు. ఇప్పుడుకూడా ఒక విజ్ఞప్తిచేయవచ్చు. కాని, ఇంతమాత్రముతో ఈ సమస్య పరిష్కారముకాదు. ఇందుకు పోటీగా మిల్లువాళ్లు చౌకగా దోవతలు చీరలు తయారుచేసి వాటికి రంగు బొర్రయ్యే వేసి అతి చౌకగా అమ్మవచ్చును. అప్పుడు సహజముగా పేదవారంతా చౌకగుడ్డనే కొందురు. వారికి చేనేత పారిశ్రామికాల కష్టాలను గుర్తించి, వారికి సహాయముచేయుటకుగాను చేనేతవస్త్రములనే కొనవలసిన తామకుకూడా లేకుండా వుంటుంది. సంఘములో ఉన్నటువంటి ప్రతిఒక్కరి అధి

12-3
p.m

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [4th November 1952]

వృద్ధి పరస్పర సహాయమునైన, అర్థిక పరిస్థితిపైన ఆధారపడియుంబుంది, అనగా inter-dependent గా ఉండుండన్న మాట. కనుక ఒక చేనేత వారిశ్రామికులకు రక్షణ ఇచ్చాము అని అనుకున్నంతమాత్రమున వారికి అది నిజమైన రక్షణ కాజాలదు. వీరు ఉత్పత్తి చేసేటటువంటి సరికును కొనుక్కోనేవారు లేకపోయినప్పుడు, వారి సమస్య ఎట్లు పరిష్కరింపగలవో ఆలోచించుకొనవలసియున్నది. అందుకనే పేదవారికి, ఖామి లేనటువంటి వారికి ఖావసరి కలుగజేసి వాళ్ల ఖాములను సాగులోనికివచ్చునట్లు తగు ఏర్పాట్లుచేసి ఆ విధంగా వారి ఆర్థిక స్థితిని అభివృద్ధిపరిచి వారి కొనుగోలుశక్తి పెంచే టటువంటి సదుపాయము గురించి ముఖ్యముగా ప్రభుత్వము ఆలోచించినట్లయితే, అప్పుడే ప్రజలందరిలో ఒక భాగమైనటువంటి ఈ చేనేత వారిశ్రామికులకు నిజమైన రక్షణ, నిజమైన guarantee కలిగిన రోజు ఏర్పడగలదు. కనుక ఈ ఆర్థికవిధానాన్ని వాగుచేయడానికి తప్పనిసరిగా ప్రభుత్వము పూనుకోవాలి, అందుకు కొన్ని ప్రాథమిక మైనటువంటి మార్పులు ప్రభుత్వము తలపెట్టాలి. కనుక కేవలము ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని అనుసరించినంత మాత్రాననే వారి సమస్య పరిష్కరింపబడదు. ఇది కేవలము ప్రథమ దారితిస్తుంది. అందువల్ల దీనితోపాటు మిగతావర్తమాకూడ తీసుకోవాలని ప్రతిపాదించిన సవరణను మంత్రివర్గము ఆంగీకరించవలెనని కోరుచూ ఈ తీర్మానాన్ని బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

* SRI H. B. ARI GOWDER :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I join hon. Members of this House who have paid tributes to the Hon. Chief Minister for the sincerity with which he is trying to relieve the distress of the handloom weavers. But beyond that, I am afraid, I cannot say much in favour of the resolution before the House. It seems to me that it is a counsel of despair. This House is at its wit's end to find a suitable solution. It is true that this resolution, when given effect to, will relieve the distress of the people concerned to some extent. But it will do so, not without affecting the interests of the people at large. For hereafter the people will have to pay more for their clothing. That has been admitted by the Hon. Minister for Industries himself in his speech. Besides that, we will be restricting the freedom of the people, which freedom has been curtailed to a large extent already in other ways. And then, aesthetically, it will put the hands of the clock back. I believe there are many members here who share my views, but few of them dare speak on this subject on the lines I have suggested, lest their speeches should be misconstrued as unsympathetic towards handloom weavers. I may say again that this measure will relieve the distress of the handloom weavers to some extent for some time; but it will not work in the long run.

“ I have not got any well-thought plan to solve this problem at the moment, but what strikes me at present is that we can relieve the distress of these people by adopting other measures than the one which is being taken into consideration to-day. Among the other measures, I suggest that we should supply the weavers with powerlooms; and where the weavers are concentrated in particular areas, we should erect mills for them. In other cases, I suggest that they be settled on land. Besides these suggestions I would request the Government to absorb them in their departmental works as far as possible and to make an appeal to others to employ

4th November 1952] [H. B. Ari Gowder]

them. I am sure the Government, and particularly, the Hon. Chief Minister, must have considered deeply the pros and cons of this resolution. But at the same time I cannot help expressing the view that has not been expressed by other Members. I think I am right in suggesting that this resolution be not given effect to, but that other suggestions may be tried. I am sure there will be quite a number of suggestions which may strike the Hon. the Chief Minister himself, if he takes a little more time to think over this problem; and it may be possible for other hon. Members of this House also to make other suggestions, if they are given time. I therefore suggest that this resolution be not rushed through."

* SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have to state that this resolution is a most commendable one; because, it relates to a very large section of the population of our State. Sir, we have seen before our eyes in the streets, may, even at the doorsteps of our house, streams of workless handloom weavers going about for their sustenance. This House is aware that their condition is most miserable. There are also other sections of people not merely in this State but in other parts of India also who are undergoing untold misery and a lot of hardship on account of other reasons. But it will not be possible for any of us here to-day to analyse the causes thereof in the limited time given to us. Further I have to speak here only on the handloom weavers' problem. In this connexion I would even pay a tribute, even though I am sitting on the opposite side of the House, to our Chief Minister for the untiring and relentless effort that he has taken to see through this problem.

“ Then, Sir, I would like to say something about the economics of handloom cloth and how the handloom cloth has got to be pushed through for the welfare of the handloom weavers in our States. In my humble view, it is not merely a question of helping the handloom weavers but it is also a question of helping ourselves. We have been accustomed for a very long time in the recent past to wear only mill clothes. We, at least some of us, have been attacking the capitalists and the machinery system but, on the other hand, we have been practising only those things which we want to put down and which we want to attack. We should have long ago taken to handloom cloth. In my view, most of us neglected this aspect. It is high time that at least now, when we have heard their cry, we should go to their succour. Let their cry not become a cry in the wilderness. This move is the most humanitarian help that has been rendered to the weavers by this Government at this stage.

“ As regards the economics of handloom cloth, an interesting article has been written by Mr. Lobo Prabhu in one of the current issues of the *Madras Information* which we are all getting free from the Government. I had occasion to go through that article with earnestness and I studied it closely. It discloses how the economics of handloom cloth goes about and how a solution of this problem would not only go to the help of the handloom weavers

[Sri V. R. Nagarajan] [4th November 1952]

but would also help ourselves. While I am speaking on this subject, I am also reminded about a lesson that I learnt while I was a student of economics in the B.A. class in the St. Joseph's College, Tiruchirappalli, where, I remember, my tutor taught me the economics of handloom cloth even as it was imagined and taught to us by Mahatma Gandhi. Handloom cloth is a matter of life and death for our own people and we cannot afford to neglect this problem. We have almost solved it and let us hope, Sir, in the name of God that this solution would be a lasting solution for those people who have been affected most. Thank you, Sir."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I also rise like my colleagues in the House to congratulate the Government and to support the resolution. There is not much to say unless one indulges in repetition. A very good case was made out by the Hon. Minister for Industries and there is very little to add to it. My only regret is that this move was not taken up by the Government sometime ago, for some distress could have been saved and some suffering on the part of the handloom weavers' families could have been avoided, if timely steps had been taken by the Government. It is not too late. I do not believe in the hackneyed expression 'better late than never' for sometimes 'late' is as bad as 'never'.

" I would like to place one or two facts before the Government. In the first place, I do not take this measure merely as an effort to relieve distress but take it also as an effort to revive and give a new life to our decaying and decadent cottage industries. The handloom industry and textiles in general received a set back on the advent of the British and the textile industry never received the kind of support that it is receiving to-day from the Government. We stand for large scale industrialization, for it is only through large scale industrialization that it is possible for us to relieve unemployment, but in the circumstances that are obtained now in our country like lack of finance, dearth of technical skill and general backward conditions, it may not be possible to have a large scale industrialization immediately. The only way out or the immediate way out is to resort to the resuscitation of our arts and crafts and thereby relieve some amount of congestion in the labour market. I am therefore wholeheartedly supporting this move and I would even suggest that the Government should pick up other cottage industries that deserve to be supported, for it would help us not only to revive our cottage industries but would, as I said, relieve the congestion in the labour market. My colleagues from Malabar have underscored the difficulties that the handloom weavers in Malabar labour under and their inability to take full advantage of the help that the Government are offering. My advice to the handloom weavers in Malabar is that as soon as possible they should readjust their looms in such a way as to make production of dhoties and sarees possible. There are a number of weavers' co-operative concerns in Malabar and it ought not to be difficult for them to get help from the Government in order to achieve this.

4th November 1952] [Dr. K. B. Menon]

“ There is, Sir, only one more fact which I wish to place before the Government and which has not received sufficient stress in this House, viz., the interest of the consumer. I do not believe in giving a *carte blanche* to the producers in a society constituted as it is to-day. Since the producers are only guided by the profit motive, there will be a tendency towards consolidation and control of prices. The reason why the handloom weavers are not able to compete with the mill-owners is because of the difference in price between the handloom cloth and mill cloth. Now, when we create monopolistic conditions and when the weavers are able to control the market, they are likely to dictate prices to the consumer. This should be avoided. The Government should, as and when they try to implement the resolution, bear in mind the interests of the consumer and see that the prices do not shoot up to such an extent that it will be difficult for the consumer to meet his demands. This is all that I wish to say. I thank you, Sir.”

* SRI S. PANCHAKSHARAM :—“ Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am glad that a Government resolution has for the first time received so much support and has been acclaimed with such enthusiasm. I wish that in other subjects too there is such unanimity from all parts of the House unless it be so controversial as to provoke opposition. This is a subject where we need be afraid that the Central Government may not come to our aid in seeing that the resolution is implemented. But my apprehension is that the opposition will be more from the vested interests who are interested in seeing that this resolution is defeated or its effect is nullified than the opposition from the Central Government itself. With the pull that our Hon. the Chief Minister has got with the Central Government, I am sure, he will be able to make the Central Government agree with the reasonableness of our request to reserve the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the handloom industry. In this connexion, we have got to face the opposition to this proposal from the vested interests. When I say, ‘opposition from vested interests’, I mean ‘opposition from mill owners’. Their business and profits will be affected if a reservation of this kind with regard to the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees is made and, I am sure, they will not take this resolution lying down and will give a good fight to the Government. I request the present Government and our revered leader to see that the vested interests do not score a point over us through the Central Government.

“ From my own enquiries and the representations that have been made to me, I learn that in some districts—one or two districts at least—towels are being exclusively manufactured, that in some districts weavers are interested only in manufacturing dhoties and that in some districts only in sarees. If towels are not included among the items to be reserved for weaving by handloom weavers, the handloom industry in one or two districts mainly interested in the manufacture of towels will be hard hit. Therefore, I request the Hon. the Chief Minister to modify the

12-40
p.m.

12-50
p.m.

[Sri S. Panchaksharam] [4th November 1952]

resolution under discussion to include towels also to be reserved along with bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the handloom industry.

“ There is also an apprehension in the minds of people that even if the Central Government accept our resolution and give effect to it and the vested interests also reconcile themselves to the present situation, the mill owners may try to manufacture white sarees of a cheaper variety on a very large scale and dump them on the market and make the poor people go in for cheaper white sarees, in which case, the effect of this resolution will be nullified. There is also a similar apprehension with regard to the reservation of bordered dhoties also. Nowadays there is a move on the part of handloom industry to manufacture borderless dhoties which we find are being sold by street hawkers and in shandies. If mills begin to manufacture mulls on a large scale and sell them cheaply, then also the purpose of this resolution, namely, to help the handloom industry will be defeated. I request the Government and the Hon. the Minister who moved the resolution to see that such attempts to manufacture plain mull and white sarees by mill-owners are not made.

“ The feeling in the country is that the proposal of the Central Government to levy a cess of three pies per yard of mill cloth is not enough to ameliorate the lot of handloom weavers and the rate of levy must be raised. The rate of levy must be many times more than the one now proposed if it is really going to make it possible for the handloom industry to compete with the mill industry successfully.

“ Besides, Government also must make attempts to remove the ban on the export of handloom goods from India imposed by Governments in Ceylon and Burmah. The lungis manufactured in our parts have got a great demand in Ceylon. But the Government of Ceylon insists that we should purchase a portion of Ceylon lungis in return for their purchasing our lungi. Government should make attempts to remove bans of this type imposed by other countries. I also endorse the proposal made by my learned friend Sri Arunachalam that whenever our Government enter into agreement with other countries with regard to the sale of mill-goods produced in our country, they should include a provision in the agreement compelling them to take a portion of our handloom goods also. With these words, I support the resolution.”

* SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :—“ கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த தீர்மானத்தை நான் வரவேற்கிறேன். இருந்தாலும் அதில் இருக்கக்கூடிய அபாயகரமான கருத்துக்களுக்கு இடம் கொடுக்கக்கூடாது என்பதற்காகத்தான் நான் சில திருத்தங்களை பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன். நம்முடைய நாட்டில் கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு ஆபத்து நம் நாட்டினுடைய மில் தொழில் வளர்ச்சி என்ற தப்பான கருத்தை இந்த தீர்மானம் மூலமாக பரப்பும் ஆபத்து இருக்கிறது. நம் நாட்டின் கைத்தறிக்கம் மில் தொழிலுக்கம் பொதுவான ஆபத்து இன்றைக்கு எது என்றால் இங்கு இருக்கும் தி செய்ப்படும் அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளியும், மட்ட ரக ஜவுளியும் தான். என்றைக்கு இந்த அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளி இறக்குமதி செய்யப்பட்டதோ அன்றே இந்த நாட்டின் தொழிலுக்கு ஆபத்து ஏற்பட்டுவிட்டது. அவைகள்

4th November 1952] [Sri M. Kalyanasundaram]

இந்த தொழிலை நாசம் செய்வதோடல்லாமல் நம் நாட்டின் இளைஞர்களின் நாகரீகத்தையும் நாசம் செய்கிறது. “முந்தேரு” போன்ற நாடகங்களை தடைசெய்யும் இந்த மந்திரி சபை நிர்வாகன பெண் படங்களை துணியில் அச்சப்போட்டு அந்த துணியை தரித்துக்கொண்டு இந்த நாட்டில் இளைஞர்கள் திரியக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் அந்நிய நாட்டு துணி இறக்குமதியை அனுமதிப்பது நமது நாட்டிற்கு அவமானமல்லவா என்று கேட்கிறேன். நமது நாட்டின் நாகரீகத்தை இழிவு படுத்துவதாலும், நமது தொழிலை சீர்குலைப்பதாலும், அந்நிய நாட்டு ஜவுளி துணி இறக்குமதி செய்யப்படுவதை தடை செய்யவேண்டும். அதற்காக நான் ஒரு திருத்தத்தை கொண்டு வந்து பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன்.

“இரண்டாவதாக நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படவேண்டும் என்ற நோக்கம் இருப்பதாக இந்த தீர்மானம் கூறுகிறது. இப்பொழுது இருக்கும் நிலைமையில் கைத்தறிக்கு எவ்விதம் நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படும் என்பதை கவனிக்கவேண்டும். நிலையான மார்க்கெட் வேண்டுமென்றால் அதற்கு இரண்டு வித வழி செய்யப்படவேண்டும். ஒன்று கைத்தறிமில் உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடிய மட்ட ரகத் துணியை உபயோகப்படுத்தக்கூடிய பெருவாரியான விவசாய பெண்களும், ஆண்களும்—இப்பொழுதுதான் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு துணிச்சுழுவில் மறுதுணி வாங்க முடியாமல் இருக்கிறார்களே—மலிவாக கிடைக்கும்படி, செய்யவேண்டும். மேலும் அவர்கள் என்ன வாங்கும் சக்தியை பெருக்கவேண்டும். விவசாயிகள்தான் பெரும்பாலும் கைத்தறி துணிகளை உபயோகிப்பவர்கள். அப்பொழுதுதான் நிலையான மார்க்கெட் ஏற்படும்.

“1947-ம் வருஷத்திற்கு முன்பாக, அதாவது நமக்கு சுதந்தரம் கிடைப்பதற்கு முன்பாக, இந்த தொழிலுக்கு இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் நமது மாகாணத்தில் மட்டும் ஒதுக்கி வைக்கப்பட்டிருந்தது. இப்பொழுது அந்த மான்யம் நிறுத்தப்பட்டு இருக்கிறது. இப்பொழுது வர்ணப் புடவைகளை ஒதுக்கி வைக்கவேண்டும் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். ஆனால் வர்ணத்தின் விலை பத்து மடங்கு உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. வர்ணப் புடவைகளுக்கு மலிவாக வர்ணம் கிடைத்தால் புடவைகளை குறைந்த விலைக்கு கொடுக்க முடியும். ஆகவே வர்ணத்தின் விலையை குறைக்கவேண்டும். இப்பொழுது வர்ணத்திற்கு இறக்குமதி செய்யப் போடப்பட்ட வருவதால் அதன் விலை அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. வர்ணத்தின் விலையை குறைக்க முடியாவிட்டாலும் கைத்தறிக்கு ஒதுக்கும் வர்ணத்திற்கு மட்டும் சப்ளிடி கொடுக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் அதற்கு இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் ஒதுக்க வேண்டுமென்றும் முன்பு இருந்தது போல் இருக்கவேண்டும் என்றும் இந்த திருத்தத்தை பிரேரேபித்திருக்கிறேன்.

“அதோடு மாகாண சர்க்கார் மத்திய சர்க்காரை கட்டுப்படுத்த இந்த 1 p.m. தீர்மானத்தை கொண்டுவரும்பொழுது, தாங்களாகவே என்னென்ன நடவடிக்கையெல்லாம் எடுக்கலாமோ அவைகளையெல்லாம் எடுத்தார்களா என்று நாம் சிந்தித்து பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

“இந்த மந்திரி சபை அதிகாரத்திற்கு வந்த பிறகு ஒரு ஹை பவர் கமிட்டி நியமிக்கப்பட்டது. அந்த ஹை பவர் கமிட்டி சில சீர்தரங்களை செய்துள்ளது. அதில் முக்கியமானது ரயான் ஸ்கீம் என்று நெசவாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து எல்லா இடங்களிலும் கோவாப்பேட்டில் சொசைடிகளை ஏற்படுத்தவேண்டும் என்பதாகும். அம்மாதிரி எத்தனை சொசைடிகள் ஏற்படுத்தப்பட்டது. ஏற்படுத்தப்படாவிட்டால் ஏன் ஏற்படுத்தவில்லை? ஏற்படுத்தியிருக்கிற சொசைட்டிகளையும் கூட ஏன் கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பயன்படுத்திக் கொள்ளவில்லையென்பதை அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட மந்திரி விசாரணை செய்யும்படி நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். சர்க்கார் உத்திரவு போட்டிருந்தும் கூட அதிகாரிகள் இந்த கோவாப்பேட்டில் சொசைடிகளை ஏற்படுத்துவதற்காக சர்க்கார் கொடுக்கவேண்டிய 2½ ரூபாய்களை நெசவாளர்களே முன்னிடி போட்டு கொள்ளவேண்டும், அப்புறம் தாங்கள் தருகிறோம் என்று சொல்லுகிறார்கள். அதோடு கூட அதில் உற்பத்தி செய்யப் படுகிற சரக்குகளை யெல்லாம் விற்பனைசெய்து கொள்வதற்கு அந்தந்த ஸ்தாபனங்களே பொறுப்பை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்ப பயமுறுத்துறுங்கள். இதனாலே சரியாக அவைகள் இயங்குவதில்லை. சர்க்கார் நெச

[Sri M. Kalyanasundaram] [4th November 1952]

வாளர்களின் நலனை உத்தேசித்து செய்யக்கூடிய முடிவுகள், திட்டங்கள் எல்லாம் அனுபவத்தில் நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உண்மையாகவே பயன்படுகிறதாயென்பதை அது சம்பந்தப்பட்ட கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் நன்றாக ஆராய்ந்து சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். சர்க்கார் நினைப்பது போல் அவர்கள் எடுக்கும் எந்த நடவடிக்கையும் இப்பொழுது நெசவாளர்களுக்குப் பயன் படவில்லையென்பதை நான் மந்திரி அவர்களுடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக சர்க்கார் இலாக்காக்களுக்கு தேவையாகும் துணிகளையெல்லாம் கைத்தறி துணியாகவே வாங்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக உத்திரவு போடுவது நம்முடைய மாகாண சர்க்காரின் கையில்தான் இருக்கிறது. அம்மாதிரி செய்யவேண்டுமென கைத்தறி தொழிலாளர்கள், சம்மேளனமும், சங்கங்களும் அடிக்கடி சர்க்காரிடமும், மந்திரிமார்களிடமும் வற்புறுத்தி வந்திருக்கின்றன. சர்க்கார் குறிப்பாக போலீஸ் இலாகா, வைத்திய இலாகா, ஜெயில் இலாகா போன்றவைகளில் தேவையாகும் துணியெல்லாவற்றையும் கைத்தறி துணிகளாகவே வாங்க வேண்டுமென்று உத்திரவு போட்டுவிட்டால் கைத்தறிகாரர்களுக்கும் அந்த ரகத் துணியை நிறைய உற்பத்தி செய்வார்கள். முழு மூச்சுடன் தறிகள் வேலை செய்ய ஆரம்பித்தால் அத்தொழில் கொஞ்சம் முன்னேற சாதனமுண்டு.

“இன்னொரு யோசனையையும் மந்திரி சபையின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவர நான் விரும்புகிறேன். சர்க்கார் இலாகாவில் கிராமத்து வெட்டியான் முதல், சிப் செக்டரி வரையில் நிறைய சிப்பந்திகள் இருக்கிறார்கள். இம்மாதிரி சர்க்கார்களில் இருக்கிற சிப்பந்திகள் எல்லோரும் கைத்தறித் துணிகளைத்தான் வாங்கவேண்டுமென்று ஒரு மாதச் சம்பளத்தையாவது கடனாக கொடுத்து அவர்கள் எல்லோரும் கைத்தறி துணிகள் வாங்கும்படியாக ஏன் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளக் கூடாதென்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். கைத்தறிகாரர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்வது போலவும் ஆகும், சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகளுக்கும் நல்லது செய்ததைப் போலவும் ஆகும்.

“இம்மாதிரியாக பல நடவடிக்கைகளை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் தான் உண்மையில் நம்முடைய மந்திரி சபை கை நெசவு தொழிலுக்கு ஊக்கம் அளிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற கருத்துடையதாக இருக்கிறதென்று எல்லோரும் நம்பமுடியும். இல்லாவிட்டால் இந்தமாதிரியான தீர்மானத்தின் மூலம் பிரசார லாபம் கிடைக்குமே தவிர கைத்தறி தொழிலுக்கு எந்த விதமான பரிசாரமும் ஏற்படாதென்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். இத்துடன் என் பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

* SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த மாகாணத்திலுள்ள கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் சென்ற நான்கைந்து வருஷகாலமாக மிகவும் கஷ்டப்பட்டுக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். அது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம்தான். அவர்கள் எனக்கு முன்பேசிய நண்பர்கள் சொன்னமாதிரியாக பின்னணுத், கத்தாழை போன்ற இப்பேரப்பட்ட வஸ்துக்களைத் தின்று பிழைத்தார்கள். பிழைக்க முடியாமல் செத்தார்கள் எத்தனை எத்தனையோ ஆயிரம்பேர்கள். இப்பொழுதாவது மீதமுள்ள நெசவாளர்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய வேண்டுமென்பதாக நமது முதன் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் செய்த இந்த முடிவை நான் ரொம்பவும் மகிழ்ச்சியோடு வரவேற்கிறேன். வேஷ்டி, கலர், சேலை போன்ற இவைகளின் உற்பத்தியை தனியாக கைத்தறிகளுக்கே விட்டுவிடவேண்டுமென்ற யோசனையை முதன் முதலாகக் குறிப்பிட்டுச் சொன்னது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களே தான். ஆகவே யார் சொல்லாமலும் அவர் வாயிலிருந்தே வந்த இந்த பிரேரணையை கடைசி வரையிலும் ஒரே எண்ணமாக இருந்து நிறைவேற்றி வைக்கவேண்டிய பொறுப்பும் அவர்களுடையதுதான். இதுவிஷயமாக எவ்வளவு இடைஞ்சல்கள், முட்டுக்கட்டைகள் ஏற்பட்டபோதிலும் அதை வெற்றிகரமாக

4th November 1952] [Sri T. Shanmugam]

முடிப்பது ராஜாஜியின் பொறுப்பாகும். இதில் கட்டாயமாக மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஏதாவது முட்டுக்கட்டை போடத்தான் செய்யும். ஏனென்றால் மத்திய சர்க்காரை நடத்துகிறவர்கள் Mill Owners. அந்த மில் முதலாளிகள் தங்களுக்கு நஷ்டம் ஏற்படுவிடுமென்று எண்ணும் போது இதை எப்படி ஆதரிப்பார்கள்? ஆகையால்தான் ராஜாஜியின் யோசனையை ஒப்புக் கொள்ளமாட்டார்கள். பல தடைகளையும் இதற்கு உண்டாக்குவார்கள். அப்படி ஏதாவது ஏற்பட்டால் நமது கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் டெல்லிக்கே நேராகப்பேய் நேருஜி அவர்களுடன் பேசி இந்த காரியத்தை வெற்றி கரமாகக்கட்டாயம் முடித்தே தரவேண்டும். வெற்றி கிடைக்காவிட்டால் நாம் என்ன செய்யவேண்டும் தெரியுமா? மத்திய சர்க்காரின் பிடியிலிருந்து நாம் கட்டாயமாக விலகி கொள்ளவேண்டும். அப்புறம் மத்திய சர்க்காரின்கீழ் இந்த மாகாண சர்க்கார் வேலை செய்யவே கூடாது. தனச் சுதந்திரத்தை ஏற்படுத்திக்கொள்ள முயல்வேண்டும். பர்மா, சிசிலான் போல தனித்து இடங்கி நம் மாகாணத்திற்கு வேண்டிய நன்மைகளை நாம் அவர்கள் கையை எதிர்பார்க்காமல் செய்து கொள்ளக்கூடிய தனி சுதந்திரத்தை நாம் அடைந்து விடவேண்டும். அப்புறம் எதற்காக மத்திய சர்க்காரில் ஒரு நாளாவது இருப்பது என்பதை நாம் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்களின் நெருங்கிய நண்பரான பெரியார் ஈ.வே. ராமசாமி அவர்கள் தமிழ் நாடு, தனித் திராவிட நாடு என்பதாக வல்லலாம் கத்து கத்தென்று கத்திக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ நீங்கள் சபையின் முன்னுள்ள subject-ஐ பற்றியே பேசுங்கள்.”

* SRI T. SHANMUGAM :—“ நான் இங்குள்ள Subject-ஐ பற்றித் தான் பேசுகிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் திராவிட நாடு என்று செ. ன்னனும் சொல்லட்டும் அல்லது சென்னை நாடு என்றே வேறு ஏதாவது பெயரை வைத்துக் கொண்டோ சொல்லட்டும். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை மில் முதலாளிகள் நிறைந்த மத்திய சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக் கொள்ளாவிட்டால் மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கும் நமக்கும் தொடர்பே வேண்டாமென்று ஒரு தனி ராஜ்யத்தை அவர் ஸ்தாபித்து விடவேண்டும். இலங்கையைப் போல பரமாவைப் போல நாமும் நம் மாகாண மக்களுக்கு பல நன்மைகளைச் செய்து கொண்டு சுதந்திரமாக வாழலாமே. ஆகையினாலே கடைசியாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நான் ஆதரிப்பதோடு இக்காரியத்தை நமது ஸ்ரீ ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் எப்படியாவது வெற்றிகரமாக நடத்திக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொண்டு என் பேச்சை முடித்துக் கொள்கிறேன்.”

SRI W. J. FERNANDEZ :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the need 1-10
for the preservation of the handloom weaving industry in the p.m.
national economy of the country has long been recognized. Spinning mills have been protected against foreign competition in order to ensure production in India of the large requirements of yarn by the handloom weavers. As there is considerable unemployment prevailing at the present time among the handloom weavers in the State, it is but right that the handloom industry should be protected against the competition of weaving mills. The Hon. the Chief Minister has urged the Union Government to prohibit weaving mills from producing bordered dhoties and coloured sarees. Such reservation, in the opinion of several eminent Weaving Specialists whom I have consulted, will not help to solve to any appreciable extent, the problem of unemployment and under-employment of a vast magnitude in this country. The State Government will before long have to seek further protection in order to help the weavers in the West Coast and other places, possessing narrow widths of looms and accustomed to weave coloured shirtings and suitings.

[Sri W. J. Fernandez] [4th November 1952]

"Sir, time is not far off when home markets in all classes of fabrics will have to be reserved for the handloom weavers and weaving mills shall have to limit their production to the extent to which they find an export market.

"The days of profit-making by mills have gone and the hour has come for the preservation of the life of the handloom weavers, irrespective of all the theories of economics of handloom cloth. The State Government should straightaway appoint a Standing Advisory Committee of Legislators, weaving experts, marketing officers and businessmen and organize the handloom weaving industry on its technical, commercial, economic and social aspects so that the consumers will have no justifiable complaint of being deprived of cheap mill cloth.

"Handloom production can be compared favourably with powerlooms provided the cottage industry is organized with a proper technical perspective. The Co-operative Department has made rapid progress in recent years in eliminating the sowears and bringing the weavers into the fold of Weavers' Co-operative Societies. No time should now be lost in rendering the handlooms a commercial weaving machine and this can only be achieved by making the spinning mills a link of the weavers' co-operative societies and serving in a proper technical manner for rendering the handlooms, vastly more productive than at present and reducing the cost of production to the utmost possible extent. Mere agitation, or a vote of this House, will not convince the Union Government that the State has done all that is necessary for organizing the handloom industry on a commercial footing before asking for reservation."

* SRI G. ANJANEYULU :—“అవ్యక్త, ఈ తీర్మానము మాకు సంపూర్ణమైన సంశ్లేషణ కలుగజేయకపోయినప్పటికీ చేనేత కార్మికులను కొంతవరకైనా సహాయపడుతుందని భావిస్తూ దానిని విలపరుస్తున్నాను.

“భారత దేశంలో ఎంతో కాలంగా ఉన్న ఈ పరిశ్రమ బ్రిటిష్ పాలనా కాలంలో పెక్కు ఇబ్బందులకు గురైంది. బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఈ పరిశ్రమను ఎప్పుడూ నిరుత్సాహపరుస్తూనే వుండేవారు. వారి దేశంలోని మిల్లు యజమానులకు లాభం కలుగజేయడం ఎట్లా ఆసే వారు అలాగే వుండేవారు. ఈ కారణాలచేత చేనేత పరిశ్రమ దెబ్బతింది. కారణాంతరాలవల్ల బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు మన దేశాన్ని వదిలిపెట్టారు. శరిపాలన కౌగ్రెస్ వారి హస్తగతమైంది. అయినప్పటికీ గత 150 సంవత్సరాలుగా బ్రిటిష్ సామ్రాజ్యవాదులు ఎట్టి విధానాలను అనుసరిస్తూ ఉండేవారో అట్టి విధానాలనే కౌగ్రెస్ పాలకులుకూడా అనుసరించారు. మంత్రులు మారారు. మంత్రివర్గాలు మారాయి. వాటితోబాటు చేనేత కార్మికుల స్థితిగతులను బాగుపరచే ఊహలుకూడా మారుతూవచ్చాయి. ఒక మంత్రి ఊహకు మరొక మంత్రి ఊహకు పొత్తుకలిసేది కాదు. చేనేత కార్మికులను రాజకీయ జూదంలో పాచికలుగా ఉపయోగించుకుంటూనే కౌగ్రెస్ గోత్రీకులు ప్రయత్నించారు కాని వారికి నిజంగా చేసిన సహాయమేది కనుపించదు. ఈనాడు రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు పాత పంథాలు త్రొక్కరని అభిప్రాయపడ్డారు.

4th November 1952] [Sri G. Anjaneyulu]

“ఇక చేనేత సహకార సంఘాలున్నాయి. వాటి స్థితిగతులుకూడా అధ్యయనం గానే ఉన్నాయని చెప్పవలసి ఉంది. ఎన్నో లోపాలు, వాటిలో కనువిస్తున్నాయి. రాజకీయాల ఒత్తిడివల్లకూడా కొన్ని సంచాలు చెబ్బి లింకున్నాయి. ఈ సంచాల లోనికి మధ్యవర్తులు, పెట్టుబడిదారులు చేరుతున్నారు. రోజురోజుకు వారి ప్రాబల్యం పెరిగిపోతుంది. కష్టించి పనిచేసే చేనేత కార్మికులకు అవి అంతగా ఉపయోగపడలేని స్థితిలో ఉన్నాయి. నూలు కొరకక కార్మికులకు పని కరువైంది. నేయడైన గుడ్డకుకూడా సరియైన ధర రావటంలేదు. సరుకు విడుదల కానందువల్ల లక్షలాది గజాల గుడ్డ నిలచిపోయివుంది. ముఖ్యంగా మా బందర్ తాలూకాలోని పెడినవంటి ముఖ్య కేంద్రాలలో చేనేత కార్మికులు విపరీతమైన బాధలకు గురౌతున్నారు. వీళ్ల మగ్గాలు నూరు మగ్గాలతో పని చేయించే వ్యాపారస్తులకూడా గుడ్డ విడుదలకాక, పెట్టుబడి లేక, దివ్యానిలేనే స్థితిలోకివచ్చారు. అందుచేత చేనేత కార్మికుని గోలుకక్కి పూర్తిగా నశించింది. నిత్యావసర వస్తువులను కొనుక్కుతేనా వారి కీనాడుస్తోమటలేదు. గుడ్డ విడుదలకాక, పెట్టుబడి లేక చేనేత కార్మికులు బాధలుపడుతుంటే గత కాంగ్రెస్ ప్రభుత్వం వారిని నానా పింసలపాలు చేసింది. దీని బత్యాల్లవైనా సంచాదిండుకోలేని స్థితిలో చేనేత కార్మికులు వారి పిల్లలకు వదులు ఎలా చెప్పించుకుంటారు. అందువల్ల ప్రభుత్వ ఉద్యోగుల పిడ్డలకు ఉచిత విద్యా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయబడినట్లే చేనేత కార్మికుల పిడ్డలకుకూడా ఉచిత విద్యా సౌకర్యాలు కలుగజేయవలసినదని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“మా ప్రాంతాలలోని చేనేత కార్మికులకు ఈనాడు ఎట్టి ఆధారంలేక కూలినాలి చేసుకొనవలసిన గతికట్టింది. పిన్నలు, పెద్దలు, స్త్రీలు, పురుషులు అనే వ్యత్యాసం మేమీ లేకుండా అందరూ కడుపు చేతబట్టుకొని కూలి ననలకై చేరుతున్నారు. ఈ విషయాలను నేను ఋజువు చేయగలను. దానికితోడు వీరి పశ్చిమ ధనికుల చేతిలో నికి పోతోంది. దానిని ఆరికట్టాలి.

“మరొక ముఖ్య విషయం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. చేనేత పరిశ్రమ యథాస్థితికి రావాలంటే దానికి కొన్ని ప్రత్యేక రకములవస్త్రాలను కేటాయించాలి. వాటిని మిల్లులు తయారుచేయకూడదని నిషేధించాలి 20, 40 లోపు నెంబరు నూళ్లు అనే కేడాలోలేకుండా చేనేత పరిశ్రమకు స్రవ్యేకించాలి. చీరలను దోపితులను మిల్లులు తయారుచేయడం ఆపుచేయించాలి. ఈ నెంబరు నూళ్లను సరఫరా చేసే ధరలకు చేనేత కార్మికులకు సహకార సంస్థలద్వారా సత్వైచేయించాలి. చేనేత కార్మికులందరు సహకార సంఘాలలో చేరునట్లుగా చూడాలి. అవసరమైన సందర్భాలలో వెరు కేపిలను ప్రభుత్వమే యివ్వాలి. ముగ్గునికొంత చొప్పున దీవన భృతి ఋణాలు యిచ్చి చేనేత కార్మికులను ప్రోత్సహించాలి. ప్రతిష్ట కోల్పోయిన కాంగ్రెస్ సంస్థను పునరుద్ధరించవలెనని సెక్రటరీజేతాక, నిజముగా చేనేత కార్మికుల స్థితిగతులను చక్కబరచుటకు హృదయపూర్వకంగా కృషి సల్పవలసినదని ఆయనను తిరిగి కోరుతున్నాను. ఇంకొక ముఖ్యమైన విషయం గురించి మనవి చేస్తాను. ఈ శాసన సభలో పలు భాషలవారున్నారు. ఒకరి భాష మరొకరికి బోధపడదు. ప్రజాస్వామిక విధానం జయత్రయం కావాలంటే అటువంటి లీర్తానకు లమీద, సభ్యులు మాట్లాడే భాష మౌఖికం ఆర్థం కావాలంటే పరిపాలన మాత్ర భాషలోనే జరిగాలి. నేడు మంత్రులు ప్రసంగించేది హాకు తెలియదు. మేము ఏమి చెబుతున్నామా వారికి అర్థంకాదు. ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో ఒకరి అభిప్రాయాలు మరొకరికి తెలియటకు గాను ట్రాన్సులేటర్లను నియమించవలసిన అగత్యం ఎంతైనా ఉంది. కాబట్టి అట్టి అనువాదకులను రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు త్వరలో ఏర్పాటు చేస్తారని ఆశిస్తూ ఇంత టీతో విరమిస్తున్నాను.”

[4th November 1952]

1-20
p.m.

*SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH:—“అధ్యక్షా, చేనేతపరిశ్రమ అనేది భారత దేశంలో అనాదిగా ఉంటూఉన్నది. చేనేతపరిశ్రామికులు ఎంతో కాలంగా జనసామాన్యానికి కావలసినటువంటి రకరకముల వస్తువులను తయారుచేస్తున్నారు. వారికి ఇదే జీవనోపాధి. ఒక కులవృత్తిగనే దానినివారు పాటించక ఆ పరిశ్రమను కళాస్వరంగా చేసేదెలాగూ సాలివారే. వినాడు అయితే వారి కడుపునిండుగా వుంటున్నదో ఆ నాడే వారు యీ చేనేతపరిశ్రమను ఉత్పత్తిచేసే విధానాన్ని మార్చి కళాస్వరంగా బట్టలను తయారుచేస్తూవచ్చారు. గుడ్డలను తయారుచేసి భోజనమునకు సరిపాడ్యుధాని ఆర్పించుటకు ఒక్కొక్కప్పుడు రంగులు మొదలగువానిని అద్దించే విషయములో అందరు కలసి సమిష్టిగా కనిచేస్తూవచ్చారు. కాని యీనాడు మిల్లు బట్టలు వచ్చినప్పటినుంచి యీ నేతపరిశ్రమ వృద్ధిపొందే అవకాశములేకుండాపోయింది. మిల్లు బట్ట తయారు అగుటకై వారి పరిశ్రమలు దెబ్బతిన్నది. ఇదియునూగాక వారికి భూములుగూడా లేనికారణంచేత మనస్సులలోని కష్టను జీవనోపాధికొరకు వంపుకొని విదోషభ్రమన పాలి నాలికొడు దగారు. వినాడు యీ మిల్లు గుడ్డలను దేశములో ఎక్కువగా తయారుఅయినదో, యీ చేనేతపరిశ్రమ అనాటినుండి మూలబడ్డది. యీ మిల్లు గుడ్డలు ప్రజలకొనుట ఆరంభించిననాడే యీ చేనేతవారికి భోజనముఉండునా, అనిపించింది. అనాటినుంచి యీనాటి వరకు చేనేతబట్టలను మానకొని యీచేనేత వారు యంత్రాలమూలంగా గుడ్డలను తయారుచేయటానికి కోరుతు పూనుకొన్నారు. కాని ఎక్కువమంది వీర ప్రజానికానికి చెందినవారుగుటచేత యీ యంత్రములను కొనుక్కొనే తాహతు లేక జీవనవృత్తిగూడాతగ్గి కొనుగోలు శక్తిలేనివారై ఉంటున్నారు. ఈ చేనేత పరిశ్రామికులకు జీవనవృత్తి కలిగించటానికి ప్రభుత్వవారు పూనుకొని ప్రోత్సహించవలసియున్నది. ఈ నాడు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్రతిపాదించ తీర్మానమును గౌరవనీయులైన సభ్యులందరూ ఒకపక్షమైనారు. ఈ తీర్మానమును కేంద్రప్రభుత్వము ఓప్పుకొనినట్లయితే యీ చేనేత పరిశ్రామికులకు ఆహారము సమృద్ధిగా లభిస్తుందని నా విశ్వాసము. ఇంకను వారికి ప్రభుత్వమువారు సహకారసంఘాలద్వారా తగు ధన సహాయము చేయగలిగితే యింకా శ్రేష్టమైన గుడ్డ తయారుచేయగలరు. అలాంటి గుడ్డలను తయారుచేయుటకు తోడ్పడే యీ తీర్మానమును నేను మనస్ఫూర్తిగా బలపరుస్తున్నాను.

“ఇంతేకాకుండా గౌరవనీయులైన సభ్యులందరికీ తెలిసినటువంటి సామెత ఒక యున్నది. ఆదేమనగా సాలినేత, మాలినేత అనేది. దీనికి కారణము పూర్వమునుంచి యీ చేనేతపరిశ్రమచేయువారు సాలికులనులేకాకుండా ముతకబట్టలను తయారుచేసే వాళ్లు మాలవాళ్లుగూడా వుంటున్నారు. వీరు చిరకాలమునుండి 10 వ నెంబరు మొదలు 20 వ నెంబరువరకు నూలుతో దుప్పట్లు వగైరాబట్టలునేసి, అమ్ముకొని జీవించుచున్నారు. యీ చేనేతవారిమాదిరి, వీరికిగూడా జీవనవృత్తి తగ్గియున్నది. కనుక యీ చేనేతవారికి దోపతులు వీరిలు ఏ విధముగ ప్రభుత్వమువారు కేటాయింప దలచియున్నారో, ఆ విధముగానే యీ మాలవారికి ముతకనెంబరునూలు కేటాయింపవలెనని ప్రభుత్వమువారికి మనవిచేస్తున్నాను. ఈ ముతకబట్టలు ముఖ్యంగా మా కడప జిల్లా జమ్మలమడుగు, ప్రొద్దుటూరు తాలూకాలలో అనేకమంది మాలవాళ్లు నేను కొంటూ జీవనమును సాగించుచున్నారు. ఇట్టివారు మనరాష్ట్రములో ముఖ్యంగా మెట్ట తాలూకాలలో వుంటున్నారు. ఇట్టివారికి ముతకనూలు 20 వ నెంబరు వరకు కేటాయింపవలెనని నిరాయోగమువారు ప్రభుత్వమువారిని కోరుతున్నాను. ఈ ముతకనూలు సాలిలు అంతగా ఉపయోగపడు. ఈ నూలు మాలవాళ్లకొని దుప్పట్లు తయారు చేస్తారు. పైన చెప్పిన విషయములను ప్రభుత్వమువారు గమనించెదరని నాపూర్వ

[Sri T. S. Ardhanari]

[4th November 1952]

அரசாங்கம் இதைச் செய்யமுடியாது. அது மத்திய சர்க்கார் செய்யவேண்டிய காரியம். மத்திய சர்க்காரை நாம் கேட்கிறோம். அதற்குப் பின்னால் அங்குள்ள மந்திரிகள் கூடி விவாதிக்கவேண்டும். அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய மில் முதலாளிகளை ஆலோசனை கேட்கவேண்டும். இன்னும் பல சடங்குகள் நடந்த பிறகு அமுலுக்கு வரும். (நீராம் முடிந்துவிடதென்பதைக் குறிக்க ஸ்பீக்ர் மணியை அடித்தார்) இன்னும் கொஞ்ச நேரத்தில் முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன், சிறிது அவகாசம் கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.

“கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்களிடம் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கக்கூடிய ஜவுளியைக் கொள்முதல் செய்து, மலிவான விலையில் பக்களுக்கு சர்க்கார் வினியோகம் செய்யாமல் இருந்தால் இந்தப் பிரச்சினையைத் தீர்க்கமுடியாது. இன்றைக்கு காஞ்சிபுரம் தொழிலாளர்களும், சேலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களும் கஞ்சித் தொட்டிகளை எதிர்த்தோக்கிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். பட்டினியைப் போக்கிக்கொள்வதற்கு நாடு பூராவும் பிச்சை எடுப்பதற்கு மனைவி மக்களோடு புறப்பட்டு விட்டார்கள். இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை நிறைவேற்றினால்மட்டும் அவர்களுடைய குறைகளைப் போக்கிவிட்டதாகச் சொல்லமுடியாது. ஆகையால், மாகாணத்தில் தேங்கிக் கிடக்கின்ற ஜவுளி பூராவையும் சர்க்கார் கொள்முதல் செய்து மக்களுக்கு குறைந்த விலையில் வினியோகிக்கவேண்டும். அதனால் ஏற்படக்கூடிய நஷ்டத்தை சர்க்காரே ஏற்றுக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். கொஞ்சமும் சிந்திக்காமல் பொதுவாக வளவோ பணத்தை சர்க்கார் விரயம் செய்கிறது. கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை சர்க்கார் வீண் விரயம் செய்கிறது. ஆனால், நம் நாட்டு குடிசைத் தொழிலாளியை கைத்தறியாளர்களுக்கு உரண்டு கோடி ரூபாயாவது சர்க்காருடைய பட்ஜெட்டிலிருந்து செலவு செய்யாவிட்டால் அது மிகப் பெரிய தவறு என்பதைச் சொல்லவேண்டியிருக்கிறது.

“சென்ற சட்டசபைக் கூட்டத்திலேயே கைத்தறி நெசவாளருக்கு உதவி செய்வதற்காக சொஸைடியில் எல்லோரையும் மெம்பர்களாகச் சேர்ப்பதற்கு நாங்கள் முயற்சி செய்வோம் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டது, மூன்று மாதங்கள் ஆகிவிட்டது. திருச்செங்கோட்டில் 31-ந்தேதி கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் விஜயம் செய்திருந்தபோது சொஸைடியில் எல்லாத் தொழிலாளர்களையும் சேர்க்கவில்லை என்று சொன்னபோது, அவர் சொன்னார், “அது உண்மையான பற்றம் இல்லை, சொஸைடியின் குற்றம்” என்று. ஆகவே, இன்றைக்கு கைத்தறியாளர்களுக்கு ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய கஷ்டங்களைப் போக்குவதற்காக ஒரு திட்டம் கொண்டுவந்தால், அந்தத் திட்டம் சரிவர நிறைவேற்றப்பட்டதா இல்லையா என்று பார்க்காமல் ஒரு மந்திரி மூன்று மாத காலமாக இரந்தது உண்மையிலேயேகைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு இமைத்த ஒரு பெரும் கொடுமை என்று நான் சொல்கிறேன். ஆகவே ஜனங்களுடைய நன்மைக்காக இயற்றப்படும் திட்டமானது சரிவர நிறைவேறுகிறதா இல்லையா என்பதைப் பரிசீலனைசெய்து பார்ப்பதற்குக்கூட அவர்களுக்கு நேரம் இல்லையென்று சொன்னால், அது நெசவாளர்களை ஏமாற்றுவதாகும் என்று எண்ணுகிறேன். தவறு ஏற்பட்ட பிறகு, அந்தத் தவறு எங்களுடையதல்ல, சொஸைடியினுடையது என்று சொல்லக்கூடியது இருக்கிறதே அதைப்பற்றி நான் உண்மையாகவே வருந்துகிறேன். இந்தத் தவறுக்குக் காரணமாயிருந்த மாகாண சொஸைடி ரிஜிஸ்ட்ரார் அவர்கள் மீது இந்தச் சர்க்கார் கண்டிப்பான நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். அப்பொழுதுதான் உண்மையாகவே மக்களுக்கு நன்மை செய்ததாகும்.

“பொதுவாக இந்தத் தீர்மானத்தை கனம் ஸ்ரீ ராஜகோபாலாச்சாரி அவர்களுடைய மந்திரி சபை, உண்மையாகவே கைத்தறி நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு சேவை செய்யவேண்டுமென்ற உணர்ச்சியோடு, நல்ல அபிப்பிராயத்தோடு, கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட தீர்மானம் என்று நான் நம்பிய போதிலுங்கூட, அதே சமயத்தில் இது ஒரு விளம்பரமாக இருந்துவிடக்கூடாது என்று நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 3 p.m.”

4th November 1952]

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not want to take more than two or three minutes. I am rising only to state that I generally support this resolution. There was some criticism to the effect that this was no solution at all. The hon. Member representing the Nilgiris—General criticized the proposals somewhat very severely. I am not going into the defence portion of it for, I believe that the sponsor of the resolution will meet all the criticisms. I was only anxious to see how it would affect the low-income groups if they were compelled to purchase only handloom varieties in case they happened to be more costly than clothes available in the immediate neighbourhood at a lesser cost. But I believe the restriction of the reservation to bordered dhooties and coloured sarees solves the problem to a great extent. While I do not say that I am able to foresee all consequences fully, yet I support the resolution. If in the light of experience it is found that consumers are put to any difficulty, I hope the Government will do the needful. I hope that this ancient cottage industry in which are involved several lakhs of people who have given to the world the finest patterns of weaving and earned a reputation for their skill from the entire world, will get the support which is necessary. Logically speaking, those who believe exclusively in scientific progress and machinery may not be able to support it. Also, those who believe in khadi may not be able to support entirely handloom which is run on mill yarn. But there are bound to be cases where logic ceases to apply in life and other values count and I believe this is one of those cases. Lakhs and lakhs of families have been wedded to this profession of handloom weaving. It has been their hereditary profession for centuries, a profession which has earned for India a worldwide reputation. In such a case I believe that logic should cease to apply and we must have different values of life. It is in this spirit that I support the resolution wholeheartedly.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am extremely grateful on behalf of the Government that support has been expressed from all sections of the House in the manner in which it has been done. The manner in which my hon. Friend Sri Viswanatham gave his support particularly delights me. This resolution has been discussed for a day and a half. It is natural that the warm unanimity that marked the support in the earlier stages of the debate gradually waned down towards the end of the debate into a somewhat critical attitude. When we discuss a thing for a pretty long time, it is natural that we seek to find differences rather than agreements as we proceed. I was not, therefore, surprised to hear Mr. Ari Gowder say that this was a desperate appeal. He expressed his doubts about the wisdom of the proposal. Mr. Fernandez also spoke in a somewhat critical strain. But on the whole, taking the various sections of the House as they have been offering support or criticism on the various matters that come up before them, the unanimity with which support has been given to this resolution is certainly most marked and significant.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[4th November 1952]

" My Hon. Colleague the Minister for Industries opened the debate with a very lucid exposition when he moved the resolution. I do not think he left out any important points and nothing is gained by mere repetition. He has put the case very clearly and concisely. The main thing to be remembered, as was observed by Mr. Viswanatham just now, is that it is not merely a problem of the textile industry or whether one form of machinery should be used to produce cloth or another form of machinery. It is not merely an economic problem. As I said more than once in this connexion, it is a problem of great human interest and value. Let us take, for instance, whether we should support cinemas or dramas. Much can be said in favour of the drama, much can be said in favour of the cinema. There is a conflict between the two. There is no doubt that the cinema has driven the drama out of the society so to say. But yet one may take a very detached view about such a problem. It may be that ultimately the drama will be found to be the better thing. It may be that the larger scope which the cinema has may make it more valuable to society. But it is not as if millions of families are involved in those fields; a few families are engaged in them. But here is an industry involving not a few families but millions of families. Making a most conservative estimate, the number of men, women and children depending on the handloom industry to-day as well as in the past and for a considerable time in the future until some unknown or unexpected industrial revolution takes place in our country, is fifteen millions. I am speaking of India as a whole. Fifteen million souls are involved in this handloom industry. Let me remind statisticians that this equals the entire population of Australia and is one and a half times the population of Canada. Any problem of occupation or profession which involves so many numbers is not merely a matter for statistical research or things of that kind, but it is one which calls for considerations of the greatest human importance. Out of this total population of weaver families, we have in our State alone $4\frac{1}{2}$ million souls to be looked after. Four and a half millions can easily be the population of one of the moderate-sized countries in Europe. So, even the population involved in our own State is large enough to attract other considerations than what seem to be moving industrialists at the present moment. If we do not consider it as the problem of a large population or of a very large number of human units, let us merely look upon it as that of a corps of skilled workers who are available in the country. Let us look upon it only as a problem as to how to deal with the skilled man-power that we have to-day in our country in this regard. Let us understand and let us realise that this large body of skilled workers are not doing national service under any compulsion of law or for an agreed rate of payment by way of wages, but they are doing it as a traditional occupation and are most willingly engaged in it. This labour force excluding all dependants and counting only the principal worker in each case comes to one million workers in our own State. It is one million skilled workers excluding the dependants, assistants and the like. Here, therefore, we are dealing in our State—concentrating only on our State—with one million workers

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

of a very skilled type. What shall we do with them? Shall we simply tell them, 'You are in a dying occupation, and therefore we do not bother about you. The rights and wrongs of this conflict be on your own head; do what you like with it'? It will be impossible to take up that attitude. If we take an all-India account of it, it would come to six million skilled workers—a corps of skilled workers. Let us remember—though it has been often said, we are likely to forget—that the skilled workers engaged in the handloom industry are more than twice the total number of workers in all other organized industries in our country. The number of workers engaged in the handloom industry is more than twice that of those engaged in other industries, textile, steel and everything included. We have really to grasp the quantum of this problem, and we have also to remember the inescapable fact that this huge man-power cannot change over to any other occupation. They have no lands. They cannot take to agriculture. They cannot find the wherewithal for it, the land for it, or the knowledge for it, or the habit for it, or even the tendency towards it. They cannot change over the habit which for generations they have acquired in this particular craft. Let us also remember that it is not mere unskilled labour. It requires early training. Skill in this craft is acquired from childhood, boyhood or girlhood. When we think of this man-power at our disposal, the importance of the problem can be realised. Ladies and gentlemen in the South do not require to be educated by me in this regard. But I am sorry to find that the problem has not been properly grasped in other quarters, and that is why I am repeating all this from this forum, so to say. We should also grasp the fact that whatever may be the reaction on other sections of the community by way of incidence, those sections of the community cannot carry on with their business or with their civic or political or family life if, round about them, six millions of people are in distress and difficulty. It is easy to make a calculation and say that the consumer would not like to pay 2 annas more for a yard or 1 anna more for a yard. Yes, the consumer may have to pay. But what happens to the consumer if there are 15 million unemployed people in India? What happens to the consumer if there are 5 million unemployed people, men, women and children, not having anything to live upon in this State? Can life go on with so much unemployment around us? Therefore, it is necessary to see the size of the problem. It is necessary to see the consequences of our present policy about it and our allowing the conflict to go on. If, therefore, we are able to grasp all these things, we cannot say then all that had been said. It is not a mere case of comparison of mill production with other forms of textile production. But it calls for different considerations of a much deeper import. And this is what I have been appealing for all the time. And why do I come before this House with this resolution? We can achieve nothing by a resolution here. But we can achieve this, i.e., we can show to the Government of India what the representatives of all sections of the communities here in the South feel about this matter and how public opinion has been formed here and has shaped itself here

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

without any steamroller agitation or anything of that kind. Of its own accord it has shaped itself. Human sympathy has shaped it. It is nothing else. If, therefore, we pass this resolution, we pass it in the hope that it will make an impression on those who have the power to order the arrangement of things in our country in this regard. If, for instance—I am putting it in another form—some of my friends will pardon me if they do not like the form, because I am putting it in that form for the purpose of impressing it on other people than those who are here—if, for instance, by any historical accident we discover on a visit to China that there the new Government had set up, on a nation-wide scale, handlooms, each costing only Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 worth of capital investment in simple machinery, and each one of these handlooms producing about 5 yards of cloth per day as against privately owned powerlooms each one of which costs Rs. 1,200 for installation and that the handloom industry spread all over China was producing 4, 5 or 6 yards in each house, and all the handlooms together produced 1,500 million yards, and that as and when more yarn is issued to them they would produce twice that quantity, we would have hailed it as a great discovery and a revolutionary discovery at that. What happens here? We have it here as it is. We have it here in every house. We have it in a million houses in our States, and in 6 million houses throughout India. We have a simple machine. If it is a pit loom with shuttle throwing, it costs Rs. 20 to Rs. 30. If it is a wooden frame loom, without digging a pit to sit over, it costs Rs. 50 to Rs. 60. The weavers have them. We have not distributed them. We have not given money for them. The men have got these already, and they are producing yards of cloth. They can produce not five yards but more yards per day if we only allow them. If we have got them already here, what is the sense in ignoring them and in depending upon the textile industry for producing our cloth and making it difficult for the handloom in refusing to make an arrangement by which the conflict could be avoided, and a stable market secured for this handloom industry? I submit that we have to exercise our imagination. The very thing that we have here, had we discovered in any other country as a result of a new enterprise, we would have welcomed as a great advance in human ingenuity and human endeavour. But when we have it here already, we are really ignoring the position. It has been observed by many visitors when they had been to China—many visitors have gone there—that 2½ million rural workers had been brought together to make a river project. Two and a half million rural workers were brought together to make a river project, and our visitors have gone into ecstasy over the discovery, and very rightly. This is not very different from that. The difference is that the thing here is already there, whereas they have brought it there for the first time. If, from that point of view, the resolution is looked at, the importance of our resolution will be appreciated by those who are not in very close touch with this matter. The visitors who went to China observed with admiration that 2½ million workers were brought to a particular river project. Also they have said that

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

this labour was not slave labour or conscripted labour. It was more or less voluntary. What is the labour here that I am referring to? It is not only voluntary, but it comes out of their hearts. It is traditional. It has been in their lives for generations, not voluntary merely for one man but voluntary for generations."

(Sri M. Hanumantha Rao rose in his seat.)

MR. SPEAKER :—" The Hon. the Chief Minister has not yielded."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, if we really contemplate and grasp the magnitude of the manpower which is engaged in the production of cloth already in our country, we can realize—my point is this and probably this is the information that is wanted by the hon. Gentleman—we can realize the tragedy of assuming that this industry must perish. That is the point that I wish to make. Very many people begin with a notion that this industry must perish and, therefore they ask, 'What is the good of allowing it to languish in this manner for any while?' They think, 'Let us allow the conflict and speed up or accelerate the conflict rather than try, by some blood transfusion, to maintain a perishing industry.' That is wrong. We cannot hand ourselves over to the tender mercies of the textile industry as a change for the better in this respect. The short-sightedness of this policy is, in my humble opinion, tragic. Powerlooms consume electricity, fuel, and all kinds of materials whereas these handlooms have not demanded and will not demand anything from us except yarn at a fair price which the weavers are willing to pay and which they will put into the product and turn over when they have a market. All that they are asking for is an easy market without a conflict. They do not even ask for subsidy. These handlooms are located in the houses of the workers, employing only the labour of their own family. It is a great decentralised industry which would really serve to maintain the texture of our rural life and not create slums in the towns along with the problems of housing, health and sanitation, with which Governments are unable to deal satisfactorily. At present, the handlooms are employed only for less than half of their full capacity. As was explained, if they produce bordered dhoties and coloured sarees to the fullest extent possible, they can produce the whole quantity which now the mills and the handlooms taken together produce. There is no question, therefore, of any risk or failure in total production.

" The proposal, which this Government have been pressing and which they have asked this House to support, is a very moderate one. There is already—let it be remembered—a good stock of mill cloth in the States. Even if we get this reservation, there is already in all the States a good deal of stock of mill cloth. That stock is lying with the wholesalers and retailers and will act as a buffer in any case. As and when the Government take steps to place an adequate quantity of yarn at the disposal of handlooms and at prices which may be deemed fair, handloom production will

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

certainly go up, if there is any truth in the laws that govern human nature and economics. There are many who maintain that handloom products have a longer life and attractive features. The real difficulty in the way, therefore, of the prosperity of the handloom industry is the fact that the price of foreign cotton enters unduly into the yarn supplied to the handlooms and that the weaving mills, as was pointed out by many speakers, have an advantage in this respect, and that there is a continual conflict in the market between the one product and the other which is priced just a little lower in order to throttle the other commodity's chances.

Now, there is a vague fear, which was expressed concretely by one speaker, that the handloom weaver and his marketing organisation will put up prices if there is no competition between the handloom products and the mill products. It is forgotten, in this connection, firstly, that numerous weavers compete with one another and they are so poor and so numerous that no effort by way of cornering will succeed. The internal competition is so great that ultimately the weaver will have to be satisfied, as he is now, with a fair subsistence wage and the cost of the material. The only thing that he wants is that the subsistence wage should not be reduced, and that is all that we ask for in this Resolution. Secondly, the mills, on the other hand, can and will certainly turn to the production of substitutes, if production of coloured sarees and bordered dhoties is taken away from them. This has been pointed out by some speakers by way of detraction of the present Resolution. No doubt the Resolution will not create a paradise for the weaver. There is the likelihood of the textile mills producing substitutes of all kinds for the cloth which has been reserved to the handloom industry, if this Resolution should be given effect to. That is true, on the one hand, but on the other, it answers the argument of risk. There is the well-known substitute for it. As we all know, people belonging to the older generation here know—we were ourselves, our fathers and our uncles were all using, what was called, mull, i.e., white cloth, which they cut into pieces according to the sizes they wanted. The handloom dhoties were discarded by many and this white cloth, cut into pieces, was used by fashionable people, who thought they looked very nice in that dress. Now they may not think so, but that was the view then. The same thing may happen again if there is any undue rise in the price of handloom cloth and the consumer finds any difficulty. What will happen is that the mills will sell substitutes of cloth fairly easily and nobody will go naked and anybody will find it difficult to clothe himself and even to clothe himself tidily. There may be a change-over to a new custom. People, who wear loose dhoties, may wear tailor-made clothes like bush-shirts and bush-coats. If that happens, we need not regret it. There will be advancement in cleanliness and tidiness of clothing and at the same time, the handloom weaver will not feel that it is a conflict that has killed him, but will take it as a change in manners, and sartorial fashions. The psychology will then be totally different from the present psychology of being stifled under mere market competition. If all of us take to rice or to wheat or change over to a

4th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

new form of diet, the merchants will not object. But if there is a different kind of rice or a different kind of wheat in the market, which stifles the traditional occupation of the people here, then comes the psychology of distress, and that is what we do not like and wish to prevent by means of this Resolution.

“ Then, again, the offer of money bonuses and stipends is in the air. Anything is welcome. We are poor and, if money is given, it won't do for us to say ' No '. But I hope that the Government of India which will offer that money, whatever it may be, will tell us what to do with it so that it may be usefully spent. I for one cannot imagine what to do with the share of Madras. It may be a crore of rupees. But what shall we do with it? How shall we help the weaver with it? Shall we put it into the General Budget and bridge the financial gap a little bit? What shall we do with that money to help the weavers? It may be a caricature, but I feel that it would be like the tiger asking the lamb to lick the former before the latter is to be eaten. Will the three pie cess which we get from the mills reduce the production of mill cloth which is to be my conflicting and throttling agency. It is dangerous to earn some money from that which is going to throttle us to the extent that we get it. It is like trying to use the drink revenue for doing propaganda against drink. As I get more money, I get foolish and would want to get more and more money and yet more money, and I would then rather like the drink revenue to go up than go down. In the same manner here, if we get a cess from the mills, unless the cess is a deterrent one, it is no advantage. If, for instance, all the hon. Members of this House agree and we have the legal power to impose a big duty on all mill-made dhoties and sarees which come into this State and if it is a deterrent duty, then I can understand the use of it. If it is a mild cess and it just tickles the mill-owners and if that cess is paid to the handloom weavers here, then it will serve no useful purpose whatsoever. What we want is a completely protected market, let it be clearly understood, in a defined field. We have not asked for too much and this defined field is a substitutable field. It is not like a man giving up a thing altogether. If a defined field is reserved for the handloom industry, there will at the same time be a vast field outside. Here is a case where he who wants to have a particular commodity and cannot get it in one field can go in for a substitute in the other. We want a protected market in a defined field for the handloom industry. The assurance of this reservation must be clearly recognised not only by the weavers, but by the intermediaries, the consumers, the retail goods agents and everybody else. Then there will be a feeling of confidence and a feeling of security and well-being in the millions of handloom weaver families, which would help not only those families, but the entire population. This vast volume of skilled man-power requires this little encouragement and security and given these, they would prove to be one of the finer elements in our society. Most of us know the conditions obtaining in the millions of weaver families. The literacy of weaver families is higher than that of the families of other workers. Their industry and civic loyalty are greater. If

3-30
p.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[4th November 1952]

only we give a little encouragement and security, the man-power will be an exceedingly valuable asset in our civic life. The mills can easily afford this and they will lose very little. That is the point which does not seem to have been fully recognised by those gentlemen who do not like our resolution. The mills can very easily afford to produce a little less than they do now, even though that should become necessary. I don't think it will be necessary. The mills do not stand in need of a particular market, namely, bordered dhoties and sarees. They can produce an infinite variety in bulk. They have a huge market. Not only that. They have a great and expanding market in Asia with a powerful organisation to help them in marketing their products. These are the conditions under which the Government of Madras have been pressing on the Government of India to accept this policy and for which we ask your help through this Resolution.

"The mental background behind the opposition to this proposal is the erroneous conviction that the handloom industry is an industry that should perish. Let us not assume things in that way. It is shocking to see intelligent men, patriotic citizens talking in terms of destruction or the extinction of the occupation of millions of families, each family consisting of more than two persons working at this craft. Whatever may be the prognosis in the economic sphere, we must take it as our present obligation to keep under fairly prosperous conditions these five million souls in Madras State alone. It is our duty to guard against the extinction of any particular wide-spread occupation. As long as these people are willing to work in their own homes with a little turnover, our bounden duty is to help them to carry on their normal honest work. Once upon a time, the East India Company, and later the British Parliament supported a commercial policy in the later 18th and the earlier decades of the 19th centuries. They carried out a policy by which India became subservient to the industries of Great Britain. Their policy was to make the Indian people grow raw products in order to supply materials for the looms in the factories of Great Britain. Now, I refer to this not as a mere stale Anti-British platform matter, but to point out that it is exactly the same policy that is now being pursued or sought to be pursued by the textile mills in India and their friends. They want the handloom weavers to perish and cotton to be grown. That is what they want. We cannot abandon millions of skilled artisans and leave them to the tender mercies of the textile industry. Some propaganda is now being conducted on behalf of the mill industry. The cry of the consumers' interest had been raised in the past and it has been raised now also. But I may tell this House that no consumer-interest can be really protected by allowing six million families in India to perish. This should be clearly understood.

"Sir, much talk is heard about improving the organisation, as if faulty organisation were responsible for the distress of the weavers. It has been mentioned by some hon. Members who do not see eye to eye with us that we should improve the weavers' organisations and the like. Now, it is no use trying to hide the obvious, namely, the conflict between the handlooms and the mills,

4th November 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

by reference to the defects in the handloom weavers' organisation. Let me remind the hon. Members that, as was pointed out by my Hon. Colleague while moving the Resolution, co-operative society organization in Madras has reached a high degree of efficiency. Two lakhs and thirty-five thousand weavers have been brought under registered co-operative societies and about twice that number are associated with many weavers' associations. But this cannot solve the problem of marketing as against the competition of mill products. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies hesitates to take more members into co-operative societies. Why does he hesitate? The moment he takes them in as members, he has to supply them yarn and production will go up and the accumulated stocks will increase. He is more vociferous than anybody else in urging the creation of a definite market. It is suggested that the Government should purchase these products. What can the Government do after buying them unless people will buy them, unless we have a definite market wherein these products could be sold? Difficulties arise not because of the defects in the handloom weavers' organizations, but because of the conflict with mill products. If we make the reservation, then it is the duty of the Government of the State to look into these matters also. It is only if we create a market, these co-operative societies can flourish and grow and absorb more and more weavers.

"The position with reference to yarn has been already explained. Hon. Members who have studied this subject closely have spoken on this aspect. We have said in the Resolution that the entire yarn that is needed for producing the cloth which we want to be reserved should be made available thereafter for the handloom weavers at a fair and reasonable price. The reason for this is that the conflict itself has resulted in the extra and higher price of foreign cotton being thrown as a burden on the handloom industry. We want that this should be avoided and so we have introduced a definite clause in the Resolution to that effect.

"Sir, I have studied the amendments that have been moved. Many of them are good and are intended to improve the administration in this State. They do not really form part and parcel of the issue of policy behind the present Resolution. The present Resolution is, so to say, a battle for the creation of a market. As for other things, they have to be and will be considered by the Government. I would like hon. Members to remember that if these amendments are introduced in the present Resolution, the result will be confusion of issues and it will make our difficult battle more difficult. We must go with clear issues and it will be the duty of the Government to see that what is necessary is done in the other respects referred to. We have asked for a fair price for the yarn supplied and we shall certainly demand adequate quantities. There is nothing to be gained by introducing words such as a 'first charge on the total production of yarn in the country' as was demanded by hon. Member Sri Kotaiah.

"My communist colleagues in the Assembly, I may be permitted to say, are suffering from an inherited complex in favour of

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [4th November 1952]

machine products. They cannot easily get out of that, though they are wonderfully alert and flexible in many matters. They find a certain difficulty in changing over from the creed of machine production. Hence they have brought in a number of amendments in spite of their full support to the main principle of the resolution. They have concentrated on what this Government have not done and what this Government are not going to do and things like that. They have said that the purchasing power of the people should be raised; that the disease is there and not in the conflict of the mill industry. This is a totally wrong conception. The conflict of the mill product with the handloom industry is a reality, a very great reality, and it has got to be got over. As regards the purchasing power of the people, it affects everything and how can we increase the purchasing power if we allow six million families in India to be unemployed! Suppose we take Madras. There are one million families here. If we allow them to be unemployed or so employed that they cannot sell the product of their profession, how can we improve the general purchasing power? Sir, this talk about increasing the general purchasing power by making agrarian reforms and the like has nothing to do with the present problem before us. There is no use mixing it up simply because, so to say, we have inherited certain complexes and ideas in respect of different subjects. I have no objection to these ideas. But they should not be brought into a discussion of this kind. Here happily I find, whatever the causes may be, that all sections of the House have given support to this resolution and I think that it is a great gain for those who have to struggle in this matter. I say 'struggle' because, I confess, Sir, the battle has been very difficult. The Government of India, though they have understood the position, find a certain conservative difficulty in making a big change of this kind by accepting a proposal of protection in this regard."

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN :—"What is the opinion of the Tariff Board?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—"I may say that not only the Tariff Board but every one including the Planning Commission appreciates our position. The difficulty, however, is one of taking a step. Such difficulties are natural. In the old days, when the mill industry of India had to struggle against the foreign mill industry importing goods here, there was protection and that protection was given by the British Government then. It was enjoyed all the time by the mill industry here and we should keep that example in mind in an internal matter like this. I am, therefore, grateful to the House for the support it has given to Government. Let it be understood that I am claiming no originality for this proposal. My name (Rajagopalachari Garu) came up in many Telugu speeches. I am claiming no originality in this matter. All that I want is that the handloom weavers should be saved from distress by being given a little help in their own self-endeavour. The mills enjoyed great protection for a long time at the cost of the consumer, as all people know. I am certain, I may say, that if there had been no unfortunate controversy raised over

4th November 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

the matter, I could have brought the industrialists to agree to this very reasonable proposal. I have not much doubt in the matter because mill industrialists have got a wide field. They can look after themselves and it is possible to bring them round. But it has become difficult just now on account of the developments that have taken place. I can assure the mill industry in the course of this debate that it will not stand to lose anything if the industrialists concede what we have asked for now.

"I hope, Sir, that the amendments will not be pressed, for the main reason that I have given, namely, that it will complicate the issue and make it difficult to go through and it may also weaken our case because specious arguments can be put forward such as 'You have not set your house in order; you have not done this; you have not done that and you have not helped them this way or that way'. Let us understand one another. I want that the duties of this Government should be separated from what we are asking now at the hands of the Government of India. Let us do what we have to do. Let us discuss and do what we must do immediately, namely, to secure the primary thing—this particular reservation—and when we get this reservation, the Government will be at the disposal of this House for discussing whatever other measures may have to be taken. Let us not confuse the issue with amendments of this kind. I hope, Sir, therefore, that my Friends will not press their amendments and give unanimity a wrong turn, so to say, of difference of opinion and that this resolution will get through with the same unanimity that it obtained at the beginning of this debate. The main policy has to be presented to the Government of India. That is what we have to press for.

"Sir, there was some reference to certain points such as import of foreign products and the like. Let me give facts. The total import for the whole year in this State of Madras of foreign cloth is 200 bales at the present moment. This import does not affect the present question at all. The figure is nothing and the cloth is mostly imported for the making of umbrellas.

"Reference was made to sales tax. The sales tax on handloom products is one and a half pies or one-eighth of an anna per rupee at a single point only. But the tax on mill-made cloth is quarter anna per rupee, multipoint. Let us not draw a red herring across the trail here. It has nothing to do with the present question. And as for Khadi, there is no tax. That is well-known.

"I think, Sir, I have dealt with the amendments and as my Hon. Colleague is not going to speak after me, I make the appeal that the amendments may kindly be withdrawn and that this resolution may be left to its fate without any confusion of issues." (Loud cheers.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"Is any hon. Member withdrawing his amendment?"

(All the movers of amendments except Sri P. Kotaiah declined to withdraw their amendments and their amendments were put to vote.)

[4th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add at the end the following :—

" This House is also of opinion that since the existing Handlooms in Malabar are such that they cannot utilise the advantage of the proposed measure of ' reservation ' to the full, the Government shall take necessary steps to help the industry to instal suitable looms and other help to those of the Handloom owners who actually deserve it, so that the existing unemployment and the consequent hardships be eradicated to some extent. (Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiyar.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add at the end after the words " imported cotton " the words " and also to reduce the price of the yarn ".

' Add at the end the following :—

" This House is also further of opinion that the Central Government should immediately constitute Purchasing Boards for handloom cloth and find ways and means to secure markets for the handloom cloth and urgently take steps to open gruel centres wherever it is necessary in Madras State out of the Central Relief Fund so as to save the life of so many unemployed weavers. (Sri K. P. Gopalan.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House is further of opinion that the Central Government and Government of Madras should take steps to make available for the Handloom Industry, yarn at production price. (Sri P. Venkateswarlu.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' Add the following at the end :—

" This House also recommends to the Government that steps should be taken—

(a) to take over the entire accumulated stock by the Government for disposal;

(b) to order the clothing needs of hospitals, Government offices, Local Boards, Municipalities, Railways, etc., from the Handloom production;

(c) to allot a sum of Rs. 2 crores as was in practice prior to 1947 for granting subsidy to Handloom Industry, every year until the industry regains prosperity; and

(d) to ban imports of all foreign textile goods. (Sri M. Kalyanasundaram.) " " "

The amendment was lost.

4th November 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' The words " a stable " in line 2 of the resolution shall be omitted, and after the words " dhoties and sarees " at the end of the first sentence *insert* the words " for one year ". (Sri P. K. Gopalakrishnan). '

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' *Add* the following at the end of the resolution :—

" This House also strongly recommends that the steps suggested above are temporary and the permanent solution for the problem of Handloom industry, the other handicrafts and trade lies in increasing the purchasing power of the peasantry, constituting 80 per cent of the population through proper agrarian reforms and in a better co-ordinated plan between supply and demand and the supply through the Mills and handicrafts. (Sri K. Venkaiah). ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will now put the amendment of hon. Member Mr. Jeevanandam to vote. The question is— 3-50 p.m.

' In the second sentence after the words " Yarn spun out of Indian Cotton " *add* the following :—

" at prices which prevailed in 1947. ' ' "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Mr. Kotaiah pressing his amendment? "

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" If the Madras Government will press for adequate supplies of yarn for the handlooms I will not press my amendment. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member withdrawing his amendment or not? "

SRI PRAGADA KOTIAH :—" I am not pressing my amendment, Sir. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" It means he is withdrawing the amendment. I hope the House gives permission to the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment. "

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER :—" Is the hon. Member Mr. Seetharamiah withdrawing his amendment? "

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—" I press the amendment, Sir. "

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' *Add* the following at the end :—

" This House also recommends to the Government that the following measures be taken in addition :—

(a) To absorb all handloom weavers into co-operative societies paying the share capital in famine affected districts such as Chittoor, Cuddapah, Anantapur, etc.;

[Mr. Speaker]

[4th November 1952]

(b) to abolish sales tax on the sales of handloom cloth;

(c) to grant subsidies to this industry by subsidising the yarn price till it regains stability;

(d) to ban all foreign imports of textile goods;

(e) to use handloom cloth in all departments of the Government, so that a large stock may be consumed by the Government; and

(f) to institute a technical committee to improve the productive capacity of the handloom industry at a lower cost." "

The amendment was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Now I will put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ This House emphatically supports the view of the Government of Madras that in order to provide a stable market for the important and widespread cottage industry of handloom weaving on which, in this State alone 4½ millions of men and women subsist, the weaving of all bordered dhoties and coloured sarees should be reserved to the handloom industry and that mills and power looms should not be permitted to weave such dhoties and sarees. This House is further of opinion that the Central Government should take steps to make available for the handloom industry sufficient quantities of yarn, and in respect of counts of 40 and below, yarn spun out of Indian cotton so as not to burden the handloom industry with the higher price of imported cotton.’ ”

The motion was carried unanimously.

V.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL^a, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, and move—

‘ *That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.*’

“ Sir, in this connexion I may as well make a resume of the circumstances under which this matter is coming up here. Hon. Members are aware that on the 28th August 1952, the Governor promulgated the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Ordinance, 1952. Shortly thereafter, in order to remove certain doubts which had arisen in regard to some details, the Government issued an Amendment Ordinance on the 5th September this year. Later on to ensure the validity of these Ordinances, the Government repealed them and re-enacted the provisions thereof by a fresh Ordinance issued on the 1st of October 1952, after obtaining instructions of the President in pursuance of proviso to Article 213, clause (1) of the Constitution. The Ordinance was intended to ease the strained relations between the mirasdars and the tenants and